

THE

R A M B L E R.

Seu vetus est verum diligo sive novum.

VOL. III. NEW SERIES.

LONDON:
BURNS AND LAMBERT, 17 PORTMAN STREET,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLX.

LONDON:

**PRINTED BY LEVEY, BODRON, AND FRANKLIN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.**

INDEX.

EDITORIAL ARTICLES.

Hefe's Life of Ximenes, 158.
National Defence, 289.
Reform, 10.
Sir Walter Scott, 39.
The Catholic University of Ireland, 1.
The House of Lords, 145.
The Negro Race and its Destiny, 170, 317.
The Political System of the Popes, No. II., 27.
The Prison-Discipline Act, 300.

COMMUNICATED ARTICLES.

On the Signs of Martyrdom in the Catacombs, 203.
The Ancient Saints, 189, 338.
The Church and Science, 68.
The Church in the Ancient Symbols, No. II., 106.
The Life and Martyrdom of Mr. Richard White, Schoolmaster, 233, 366.
The Limits of our Thought, 83.
The Philosopher's Stone, 223.
The Spirit-Rappers, 357.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Belgium, 123.
Catholic Education, 248.
Collegiate Education, 401.
Russia, 119.
Seminaries of the Church, 398.
The Ecclesiastical Policy of Louis Napoleon, 115.
The Russian Church, 388.
The Signs of Martyrdom in the Catacombs, 114, 253.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Bowring's Visit to the Philippine Islands, 260.
Dolan's Gregorian Hymns for Vespers, 409.
Domenech's Seven Years' Residence in the Great Desert of North America, 410.
Owen's Palæontology, 127.
P. Charles of St. Aloysius' Statistisches Jahrbuch der Kirche, 262.

CURRENT EVENTS.

HOME AFFAIRS.

Home Policy, 128.
Indian Legislation, 417.
Irish Education, 418.
National Defences, 411.
Parliamentary Reform, 265.
Privilege of the House of Commons, 414.
The Religious Census, 416.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Annexation of Central Italy to Piedmont, 130.
Annexation of Savoy to France, 139.
Austria and Hungary, 143.
Emancipation of the Serfs in Russia, 281.
France and Europe, 419.
Spain, 279.
Syria, 426.
The Papal States, 425.
The Revolution in Italy, 273, 421.

WORKHOUSE PAPERS.

“ Tibi derelictus est pauper: orphano tu eris adjutor.”—

Ps. ix. 38.

No. 1.

MAY 1, 1860.

1d.

INTRODUCTION.

ACCORDING to the last Report of the Poor-Law Board, in the year ending Lady-day, 1858, the mean number of paupers of all classes (including children), at one time in receipt of relief in England and Wales, was 908,886. The population of this country being estimated at the same time at 19,444,000, the ratio per cent. of paupers relieved on the whole population was 4·7, or one in every 21 or 22 persons. The number of paupers, receiving indoor relief, was 122,613.

From the same official document we learn the following facts respecting the number of children receiving education in Workhouse and District Schools.

Average number during half-year ending Lady-day, 1858 :—

	Workhouse	District.	Total.
Boys under 10 years of age ...	9,174	750	9,924
Boys above 10 ” ...	8,712	814	9,526
Girls under 10 ” ...	9,862	670	10,532
Girls above 10 ” ...	7,207	679	7,886
	34,955	2,913	37,868

Or, if summed in another way :

	Boys.	Girls.	Total.
In Workhouses ...	17,886	17,069	34,955
In District Schools ...	1,564	1,349	2,913
	19,450	18,418	37,868

In the Appendix the number of children attending Workhouse Schools

No. 1.

1.

in England and Wales is given in detail. The Unions here named are 660. From this number is to be deducted :

No Workhouse	3 Unions.
No Teachers	92 "
Attend District School	...	24	"
Attend National School	...	21	"
Attend Village School	...	3	"
Attend Particular School	...	2	"
No returns of Children	...	67	"
			<hr/> 212 Unions.

We thus learn that the 34,955 children are receiving their education in 448 Workhouses. The District Schools to which the Report assigns 2,913 children are six in number, of which three are Metropolitan.

If we turn to the Metropolis, the same Report embodies a communication from Mr. Farnall, the Metropolitan inspector, which commences thus :

"There are usually 8,900 children in the Workhouses and several "detached Schools of the Metropolitan District, and of this number "3,700 are found in Workhouses, and 5,200 in separate or District "Schools. Of the above 8,900 children, 6,900 or 77·5 per cent. are "receiving education, the remainder being principally infants. Their "education consists of moral, mental and industrial training, and 3,235 "of them are being trained in industry."

From this we gather that the pauper children of the Metropolis, attending School, are thus divided :

In District Schools	2,519
In separate Workhouse Schools	2,681
In Workhouses	1,700
			<hr/> 6,900

In the thirty Unions of the Metropolis, on the 1st July, 1858, there were the following inmates of Workhouses :

Males	4,807
Females	7,069
Children under 16	6,446
			<hr/> 18,322

Such statistics are sufficiently appalling. We know from these official returns that our Workhouses have more than one hundred and twenty thousand inmates, and that in the Schools attached to these Workhouses more than thirty-seven thousand children are being educated, to omit all mention of the ninety-two Unions, at least, where they are without teachers, or the five-and-twenty where they are sent elsewhere for their instruction.

No Catholic believes that, amongst these, even the majority of the Catholic adults receive the consolations of the Catholic religion, or doubts that a vast proportion of the children, who ought to be brought up in the Catholic Faith, are trained to desert the Church to which their parents belonged, and to refuse to listen to the teaching of the Clergy who baptized them in their infancy. But the extent to which the adults are debarred from access to the Sacraments, from Mass and from instructions, and the number of the children who are annually made Protestants in spite of the claims of justice and the professed principles of the country, can be estimated only by those who are in the habit of visiting the Catholics in these institutions.

That an evil of such serious proportions, and involving such fearful consequences to immortal souls, might be combated by a consistent and persevering effort, the Clergy of Westminster and Southwark appointed a numerous Committee from amongst their body to deliberate upon and promote the best means of remedying so unhappy a state of things. Amongst other resolutions, the Committee, who have placed their work under the patronage of Our Blessed Lady, under the title of her Immaculate Conception, have determined to ask every priest of the two dioceses to help them to collect accurate statistics of the actual position of the Catholic religion in the several Workhouses and District Schools, and also to issue, periodically, a paper with the object of diffusing as widely as possible a knowledge of the disadvantages under which such poor Catholics, as need the help of the Poor Laws, are forced to live. In some cases it will perhaps be transgressions of the law, at least of its spirit, that we shall have to publish, but in most instances it will be that of which the public is but vaguely informed, if informed at all, the hardships that the law itself inflicts upon Catholics in this respect. The Committee are of opinion that the widest publicity that can be given to the cases of injustice as they occur will be the best, and perhaps the only

means of procuring the alteration of the laws that have inflicted such wrong.

We hope, therefore, to be able to put before our readers, at one time a succinct statement of the actual law; at another time arguments in favour of those alterations in it which our wants demand: in one paper to publish accounts of struggles that have been successfully brought to an issue in particular cases, which may serve as precedents in others; in another paper, examples of hardship, either from the faults of the law itself, or from the manner of its administration in particular localities; and lastly, we shall always be glad to lend our aid, not only in forwarding the amendment of Catholic grievances, but also in promoting every reform of the Workhouse system, which must have an interest for us in common with all our countrymen.

The Committee naturally address themselves, in the first instance, to their brethren who appointed them, but as the hardships of the Catholics of the Metropolitan Workhouses are by no means exceptional, and as the working of the Poor-Law presses with equal severity on all the Catholic paupers of England and Wales, they look forward to an harmonious co-operation with both Clergy and Laity of the other dioceses, and to all alike do they turn to assist them in an undertaking, the responsibility of which they felt themselves bound to risk. They trust, therefore, that every one who feels that a temperate discussion of these points in which all Catholics, and indeed all our countrymen, are interested is now much needed, and that good must result from a wide-spread knowledge of well ascertained and carefully sifted facts, will give such support to this little periodical as may lie in his power. Messrs. BURNS & LAMBERT will forward it to all those who may give them instructions to do so, and it may be obtained in the usual way of all booksellers. The Committee hope that those who are inclined to assist them in circulating information on this subject, would not begrudge a shilling a month as a subscription for a dozen copies (post free) for distribution.

The circular and lists of enquiries which they have forwarded to the Clergy of Westminster and Southwark are given in the present number for the information of their brethren throughout England, and they wish to express the pleasure it will give them to receive communications from every part of the country. The Committee hope that it is not needful

for them to say that a work placed by them, at its outset, under the patronage of Our Blessed Lady, will be carried on in filial dependence upon and submission to Ecclesiastical superiors.

CIRCULAR TO THE CLERGY OF WESTMINSTER AND SOUTHWARK.

24, Golden Square, London, w.—*April 10th*, 1860.

Rev. Sir,—The Workhouse Committee, appointed by the Clergy, having determined on their course of action, are very desirous of receiving the cordial co-operation of the Clergy, by which alone they can hope to bring their endeavours to a successful issue.

A deputation having recently put before the Poor-Law Board a statement of the grievances to which Catholics are subjected by the working of the present Poor Law, the Committee is liable to be called upon for the instances in which these hardships have been most severely felt. And as it has been universally regarded to be necessary that application should be made to the Legislature for the amendment of the present law, and renewed from time to time until our grievances are entirely removed, the Committee have resolved to bring the injustice and oppression of the law before the public by publishing periodically the details of the cases they may receive from the Clergy. The Committee have therefore to ask that the Clergy would supply them at their earliest convenience with all the information in their power, and would continue to furnish them with any fresh cases that may arise. They venture to suggest that, in addition to the strictest accuracy, facts which are intended to serve as the basis of applications to Parliament or to the Poor-Law Board, should be illustrated by every detail however minute, provided it is relevant. By details, it is hardly necessary to say, are meant the names of the parties, the dates, the scene of the occurrence, the persons who were present, &c.

In order that the Committee may efficiently carry out the work with which they have been intrusted, they appeal to you, Rev. Sir, to answer the inquiries in the accompanying paper at your earliest convenience.

The Committee would be much obliged for any further information on this important subject with which you may be able to furnish them.

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Your very faithful servant,

JOHN CAN. MORRIS,

Secretary to the Committee.

A list of subscriptions and donations has been opened to meet the necessary expenses of the Committee and further contributions are earnestly requested. All sums may be paid to "The Workhouse Fund," at the London Joint Stock Bank, Pall Mall, S.W., in the names of the Very Revs. Canon O'Neal, V.G., and Canon Morris.

 _____ *Workhouse, attended at present by the*
Rev. _____
 _____ *Mission.*

Date _____

Wherever the answers refer to particular cases, have the kindness to write the details of each case on a separate paper.

- ~~~~~
- 1.—Where is your Workhouse situated, and to what Parishes does it belong?
 - 2.—To how many Catholics over sixteen, and how many under sixteen, have you access?
 - 3.—Are there any others in the house whom you have reason to believe to be Catholics?
 - 4.—How do you obtain knowledge of new Catholics?—Is the Creed Register kept, and are you allowed access to it?
 - 5.—Have you had any instance of a request to see you made by any inmate being neglected, refused or delayed?
 - 6.—Has any inmate died without sufficient religious attendance from neglect of sending, or difficulty of access?
 - 7.—Are you allowed to repeat your visits to those who have once requested your attendance without any further request?
 - 8.—May you visit at any time, or under what restrictions are your visits placed?
 - 9.—Have you the opportunity of assembling the Catholics for religious instruction?
 - 10.—Have you any opportunity of hearing the confessions of those who are not sick or infirm, or of giving them Communion in the house?—Has any objection been made to your doing so?—Have the inmates in any other way opportunity of receiving these sacraments?
 - 11.—Are all the inmates allowed to attend Mass on all Sundays and Holidays, or what is the rule followed upon this point?

- 12.—Have you ever applied for any of the inmates to attend Confirmation, and with what result?
- 13.—Are children born in the house allowed to be taken to the Church in due time for Baptism?—If not, or in case of illness, have you easy access to Baptize them, or are any difficulties thrown in your way?
- 14.—Are you allowed to give or lend religious books at your discretion to Catholic inmates, or what rule exists upon the subject?
- 15.—Have you had any cases of Catholics being unjustly or unkindly treated on account of their religion?
- 16.—Are any instructions, discourses, or prayers allowed to be made by the Chaplain or others in Wards from which Catholics are unable to absent themselves?
- 17.—Are they obliged to attend any prayers or religious service?
- 18.—To what Schools are children sent from the Workhouse?
- 19.—Have you any means of knowing what orphans or deserted children are sent from the Workhouse to the School?
- 20.—What means have parents or relatives in the house, whose children are sent to the School, of expressing their desire that they should be educated as Catholics?—What course do you usually recommend them to follow in such cases?
- 21.—Have you had any case of undue persuasion or influence being used to deter them from expressing their wishes on this point?
- 22.—How often are parents or relatives allowed to see the children who have been sent to school?—Have they any means of communicating with them or hearing from them?

_____ *Workhouse [or District] School attended at present by the Rev.* _____

Mission _____

Date _____

Wherever the answers refer to particular cases, have the kindness to write the details of each case on a separate paper.

~~~~~

1.—Where is the School situated?

2.—From what Unions is it supplied with children?

- 3.—Is any Creed Register kept, and have you any access to it?—What means have you of learning the arrival of Catholic children?
- 4.—To how many children have you access?
- 5.—What forms of application have you had to go through in order to obtain access to them?
- 6.—Have you had any particular cases of delay or unnecessary trouble or hardship arising from the requirement of these forms?
- 7.—Are there any other children to whom you believe you ought to be allowed access according to the present law?—How does it happen that you have it not?
- 8.—Are there any other children in the house whom you consider ought in justice to be educated as Catholics, but to whom, by the present law, you are unable to obtain access?
- 9.—What amount of access is permitted to you to children once recognized as Catholics?
- 10.—What opportunity have you of hearing their Confessions, giving them Communion, and getting them Confirmed?
- 11.—Can they ever hear Mass?
- 12.—Are you allowed to give them any religious books, pictures or rosaries?
- 13.—Have you the opportunity of visiting them at your discretion when they are ill?
- 14.—Are they required or permitted to attend any Protestant prayers or instructions?
- 15.—Are you aware whether the Chaplain is allowed to speak to them on the subject of religion?
- 16.—Do you know of any instance of undue persuasions or misrepresentations having been used in order to pervert them, or of their having been treated with any unkindness or unfairness by any of the officials, servants or children, on the score of their religion?
- 17.—Have any of them apostatized, and what has been the reason of their doing so?
- 18.—Have any Catholic children been apprenticed or put to service, and have you any means of ascertaining where and under what circumstances; is any notice given of the fact to their relations when they have any?

---

**No. 2 will be published on the 1st of June.**

---

*Published for the Workhouse Committee by*  
**MESSRS. BURNS & LAMBERT, 17, PORTMAN STREET,**  
**AND PATERNOSTER ROW.**

*Sold in packets of a dozen, post free, for a Shilling in advance: single copies One Penny, or by post Two pence.*

---

Printed by W. DAVY & SON, 8 Gilbert-street, Oxford-street, W.

# THE RAMBLER.

## CONTENTS OF PART VII.—MAY 1860.

|                                                                                                                                   | PAGE    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| The Catholic University of Ireland . . . . .                                                                                      | 1       |
| Reform . . . . .                                                                                                                  | 10      |
| The Political System of the Popes.—No. II. . . . .                                                                                | 27      |
| Sir Walter Scott . . . . .                                                                                                        | 39      |
| <br>COMMUNICATED ARTICLES :                                                                                                       |         |
| The Church and Science . . . . .                                                                                                  | 68      |
| The Limits of our Thought . . . . .                                                                                               | 83      |
| The Church in the Ancient Symbols.—No. II. . . . .                                                                                | 106     |
| <br>CORRESPONDENCE :                                                                                                              |         |
| The Signs of Martyrdom in the Catacombs . . . . .                                                                                 | 114     |
| The Ecclesiastical Policy of Louis Napoleon . . . . .                                                                             | 115     |
| Russia . . . . .                                                                                                                  | 119     |
| Belgium . . . . .                                                                                                                 | 123     |
| <br>LITERARY NOTICE . . . . .                                                                                                     | <br>127 |
| <br>CURRENT EVENTS :                                                                                                              |         |
| <i>Home Affairs</i> :—Home Policy . . . . .                                                                                       | 128     |
| <i>Foreign Affairs</i> :—Annexation of Central Italy to Piedmont—An-<br>nexation of Savoy to France—Austria and Hungary . . . . . | 130     |

### **Notices to Correspondents.**

Communications must be addressed, post-paid, to MESSRS. BURNS and LAMBERT, 17 Portman Street, Portman Square, London, W. ; and no Communications can be returned.

# THE RAMBLER.

---

VOL. III. *New Series.*

MAY 1860.

PART VII.

---

## THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

THE success or failure of the Catholic University of Ireland is a matter in which not Ireland alone is interested. While, in the event of a success at all commensurate with the hopes of its projectors, the sister island would reap the principal share both of the glory and of the profit, it is certain that English and colonial Catholics—nay, the whole English-speaking Catholic population of the world—would all be more or less benefited; and similarly, the collapse and failure—*Dii avertant omen*—of so great an enterprise, while it redounded principally to the disgrace of Ireland and the detriment of all Catholic interests in that country, would entail some share in the loss, some participation in the shame, on those Catholics in other parts of the empire who joined in laying the foundations, but have perhaps been too neglectful of the progress of the superstructure. Justifying the proceeding, therefore, on the plea of community of interest, we shall take this opportunity of briefly reviewing the present state of the Catholic University, and consider what measures may be necessary or expedient to secure for it a brilliant and useful future.

We have not been able to procure any calendar, or other authoritative document, showing the actual state of the Catholic University during the present session; but from the most reliable information which has reached us, it would appear that the number of its students does not exceed that of last year, and is rather on the decrease than otherwise. We are confident that we do not understate the number of *bonâ fide* matriculated students, when we estimate it as under fifty. It is true that there is a flourishing medical school in connection with the University; but the fact affords no criterion

of the general success of the institution. The medical school in Cecilia Street existed before the University came into being, and would continue to exist if the University were to be closed to-morrow. The condition of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, or Arts, is the true test of the progress of any university. Tried by this test, the Catholic University offers no reassuring ground of confidence to its well-wishers.

With regard to the government of the University, it would appear that it has been carried on for the last few months in conformity with the decisions announced in the pastoral of the Irish Episcopate dated in November last. No rector has been appointed; but the episcopal board to which the affairs of the institution have been intrusted have had occasional meetings, at which some important decisions have been arrived at. By one of these, the examination for entrance has been remodelled; by another, the fees charged to extern students have been reduced by two-thirds of their amount. This latter change has been made so recently, that its effects have not yet had time to manifest themselves.

The inauguration of this University board was undoubtedly a very wise and desirable measure, both with a view to increase public confidence in the institution, and also as furnishing a convenient and readily accessible channel through which the future rector could learn the predominant sentiments of the Episcopate and the whole clergy, and in turn communicate to them his own views, upon all the more important academical questions. It supplied a missing link in the chain which should bind the University in closest union with the religious and national life of Ireland. But in this chain, it must not be forgotten, an efficient rector is a link yet more indispensable. Without such an officer, the University has neither a will nor a hand; its mechanism may be perfect, but the *power* has been left out.

To complete this brief sketch of the present state of affairs, it must be mentioned that the University is still without a charter from the crown, and therefore cannot legally confer degrees upon its students. With regard to the medical school, the disqualification is of little consequence; since the licenses or diplomas of medical men are not with us, as in most foreign countries, issued solely, or even chiefly, by universities, and the existing licensing bodies have all, or nearly all, recognised the school in Cecilia Street as a fit and qualified place of medical education. But upon students in all the other faculties the impossibility of obtaining a degree cannot but operate as a serious hardship.

It may be useful, after returning from a survey in which we have found so little to cheer us, to cast our eyes across the water, and examine the actual condition of a sister institution, which the founders of the Catholic University of Ireland were expressly desired by the Holy Father to look to as their model. We refer to the University of Louvain. We really do not know of one eminent advantage, nor of one serious drawback, which the University of Louvain does not share with her less prosperous sister. Belgium has a large Catholic population; so has Ireland. The Catholic University of Belgium was founded and favoured by one Roman Pontiff; so was that of Ireland by another. The universities in Ireland supported by the state are Protestant or secular; those in Belgium which receive the same support are secular or infidel. How is it, then, that the inquirer into the fortunes of Louvain beholds a scene of unchequered activity, animation, and success, existing under conditions so similar to those with which the Irish University appears at present unable to cope?

The prosperity of our neighbours is, or should be, a pleasing subject of contemplation at all times; but when in that prosperity we find matter of warning, humiliation, or encouragement for ourselves, it becomes doubly interesting to trace the steps by which it was attained, and to examine the conditions of its permanence. Of such an instructive career of success we find a record in the *Annuaire de l'Université Catholique de Louvain* for the year 1860. This institution, as we said before, furnished the model upon which the Catholic University of Ireland was framed; and if the fortunes of the two have been widely different,—if the one has nothing but success to point to, the other, at best, a chequered and fitful career, divided between good and ill,—the supporters of the younger institution may perhaps find an explanation of the causes of much in its history that has saddened and disappointed them in a careful review of the circumstances and modes of action which at Louvain have issued in an unexampled prosperity.

In the first place, those too liberal Catholics who maintain that a Catholic university is not wanted, and that the materials do not exist in Ireland out of which it can be formed, may be surprised to hear that in a country with a Catholic population considerably smaller than that of Ireland, and in the face of the rivalry of the non-Catholic Universities of Ghent, Liège, and Brussels (which hold a corresponding position to the Queen's University in Ireland, and, like it, are supported and patronised by the government), the number of

students at Louvain has regularly and steadily increased, until, from 86, the number registered in 1835, the opening year of the University, it has swelled in 1859 to 754.

In the next place, those too ardent well-wishers of the Catholic University of Ireland who would literally kill it with kindness, and while claiming for it privileges too exalted to be realised, neglect the practicable and attainable advantages which lie at their feet, must be informed that the successful and triumphant institution of which we speak does not pretend, in the case of the vast majority of its students who seek degrees, to confer those degrees of its own authority, but sends them before a mixed "jury," or board of examiners, appointed by the state, who stand in precisely the same relation to Louvain as to the non-Catholic Universities of Ghent and Brussels. In the year 1829, three hundred and twenty-five academical degrees of all kinds were conferred on students of Louvain by the mixed juries, while only twenty-three degrees, of which fifteen were in theology and canon-law, were conferred by the University itself.

The question now arises, whence this extraordinary difference in the respective careers of two institutions founded under the same auspices and upon the same principles? How comes it that Louvain, in the fifth year of its existence, had 490 students on its roll, against 86 students in the first year; while the Irish University, in the sixth year of its existence, has notoriously not increased its numbers above what it could boast of at the very opening of its schools?

To this question it seems to us that a simple and intelligible answer can be given. First and foremost,—for Louvain the right man has been found. Monsigneur de Ram, the rector, has administered the affairs of the University with unflagging zeal and incomparable ability during twenty-five years. To the Irish institution a man of genius was only lent for a time, and then snatched away:

"Ostendent teris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra  
Esse sinent."

Secondly, at Louvain a rational and practical arrangement was adopted from the first, under which its students were enabled to obtain, on equal terms with those of any other Belgian university, *available* certificates of intellectual attainment, in the shape of state degrees. People are too apt to fancy that the knowledge gained is every thing, and the formal acknowledgment of it little or nothing; but the notion may easily be carried too far. It is good to have a lump of gold; but it is far better to have that gold coined into sovereigns, and stamped with a known authentic stamp, be-



cause then your gold will be *available*, it will pass current in the world. So it is with degrees: to have the knowledge is a good thing; but to have it recognised by competent and public authority is far better. It is to be noted also, that the hope of obtaining such recognition, in other words, of taking a degree, animates many to labour for the attainment of knowledge to whom the love of it for its own sake would not have been a sufficient spur, and acts as an additional stimulus to all.

Let us turn now to the Catholic University of Ireland. There is no present provision by which a student matriculated in it can take a degree, either in arts, law, or medicine, which the state and general society will recognise. The late government was applied to for a charter empowering the University to confer degrees, and Mr. Disraeli appeared to lend a gracious ear to the proposal. Those who were simple enough to believe in the possibility of a genuine alliance between Irish Catholics and English Tories predicted with eager confidence the speedy realisation of these hopes. But the delusion was soon dispelled. A well-timed question from Lord Shaftesbury, put on the eve of a critical division, when to coquet with a dozen Irish Catholics might have imperilled the support of a hundred English Protestants, drew from Lord Derby the declaration, that "the government had no intention of advising her Majesty to grant a charter to the Catholic University." From the present government there is, of course, not the slightest chance of obtaining such a charter as was asked for from Mr. Disraeli; they having taken every opportunity since they came into power of declaring their intention to support the system of mixed education.

This, therefore, is the state of things at present,—the Catholic University has no rector, and any student who enters it must, so far as appears, renounce the hope of taking a degree which will be of any use to him. Let us consider these two disabilities separately.

It is surely unnecessary to use many words in order to demonstrate that a young and struggling institution cannot possibly flourish—can, in fact, only decline and deteriorate,—so long as it has not one active and responsible ruler. As well expect the solar system to go on and prosper without the sun, or a ship to be well navigated without a captain, as that a school, college, or university can flourish while carried on by subordinate officers, undirected by one supreme head. Doubtless an institution which has been once set on foot by an able ruler, and has commenced to work, may continue to exist and perform its functions in a dull mechanical way for

some time after the ruler has been removed. But the force by which it does so is, after all, only the *vis inertia*,—the power by which motion, once communicated to a body, tends to perpetuate itself,—and must inevitably be overpowered before long by the friction of the counteracting obstacles. Even at Oxford, with its history of a thousand years, the want of a Vice-Chancellor (who is, for all practical purposes, the supreme head of the University) would soon create incalculable confusion. Who does not remember the repeated complaints which have been made of the non-residence, or insufficient residence, of the presidents of the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway? Yet in each case the supreme ruler existed; he was *in rerum naturá*; nay, he was in Ireland, and could be appealed to at any moment to settle any difficulty that might arise. But at the Catholic University no such officer exists.

That we do not exaggerate the importance of this question of a rector, let the following extract from the little book already cited bear witness. At the festival held at Louvain in November last, in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the University,—a festival joyous and glorious for all who partook in it,—after the Belgian and the foreign students had in turn presented addresses to the rector, in which he is spoken of as the “glorious and living symbol of the University,” the professorial body came before him to present an honorary medal for his acceptance. In their address on this occasion they say: “When we remember the origin and the progress of the great scientific institution which has grown up under the constant impulses of your generous and fostering zeal, we unite ourselves to all the Catholics of Belgium in order to pay a tribute of admiration to the eminent man whom a protecting Providence pointed out to the choice of our venerable Bishops. . . . When we think upon all the proofs of devotion and talent which you have so lavishly given in the course of your long career, upon all the services which you have rendered to religion, to science, and to your country, we congratulate you, with all the energy of our souls, on the success which you have obtained, on the good which you have realised, and on the recompense which awaits you in the bosom of God and in the grateful remembrance of posterity.”

But we are wasting words; for in theory at least no one is likely to dispute the paramount importance of an able rector to a young institution. The difficulty is probably a practical one,—that it is not easy to find a person both willing and qualified to fill the office. To such a plea it might

be replied, that if the University is to go on, a rector must absolutely be found. If among the clergy of Ireland there exists at the present moment an individual both competent and willing (or even *compellable*) to undertake the post, surely a diligent and determined search would soon bring him to light, and place him at the head of affairs. But if such a search should result in disappointment, then, since a rector is *indispensable*, it would surely be better to close the University until happier times, than to spend more money and waste more human effort in an enterprise which must inevitably fail. To treat the question in this way appears to us tantamount to a *reductio ad absurdum*. The Irish clergy number amongst them—it cannot be doubted for an instant—many devoted, able, and learned men, to any one of whom this trust might be committed. Our object is merely to press, in the most forcible language that we can command, the absolute necessity of making this appointment without further delay.

The second obstacle with which the University has to contend is, the inability of its students to procure degrees. To clear up this subject, let us enumerate the degree-conferring bodies which at present exist, both in England and Ireland :

1. The Catholic University has itself the right, granted to it by the Holy See at its foundation, of conferring degrees ;

2. The Queen's University has the power of conferring degrees, in arts, law, and medicine, upon students of the three Queen's Colleges ;

3. The University of Dublin confers degrees on the students of Trinity College ; and

4. The University of London confers degrees upon students belonging to certain institutions connected with it, or even upon persons privately educated, who can pass the requisite examinations. (We omit all the other English Universities, because they require actual local residence as a condition of obtaining their degrees.)

Let us now consider these four cases *seriatim*.

Had the inherent right of conferring degrees which the University possesses been boldly yet cautiously exercised in the second or third year of Dr. Newman's rectorship, when the tide in its affairs was flowing, when hopes were high and sympathy universal, it is not improbable that the attempt would have succeeded. But under actual circumstances, mistrust having in too many quarters supplanted confidence, it would evidently be undesirable to exercise the right in question, except in the very last resort. For it must always be remembered that in this matter the interest of the student

is the main consideration. It would be easy for any school or college to subject a young man to a difficult examination, and then to dub him B.A. or B.D. of the said school or college; but what would be the use of such a distinction to the young man? Being unrecognised by general society, and not conferred by competent authority, it would simply be scouted and despised. Now the Catholic University possesses, it is true, the competent authority; but the other element in the value of a degree, the recognition of society, would, under present circumstances, be wanting.

With regard to the second case, no student of the Catholic University could in the present state of the law receive a degree from the Queen's University. Nothing could enable him to do so but an act of parliament constituting the Catholic University a Queen's College. But this is totally out of the question, since the present legal constitution of the Queen's Colleges has been pronounced by the Holy See and by the Irish Episcopate to involve dangers to the faith and morals of Catholics attending them.

Thirdly, were there no other obstacle to the students of the Catholic University obtaining degrees from the University of Dublin, the expense would effectually prevent it. In order to take the degree of B.A., a candidate must have paid during three years the high tuition-fee of Trinity College; if to this were added the annual fees of the Catholic University, the expense of a degree to a student of the latter would become ridiculously great.

Lastly, the B.A. degree of the University of London, under existing regulations, could be obtained without any great difficulty or expense. The degree itself is, indeed, as yet not equally valuable with those of older universities; like the Scottish "pound," it passes current in society at a rate far below its Oxford or Cambridge namesake; still it is recognised, and is yearly becoming more valuable. Its being an *English* degree constitutes, in the present case, a serious objection. Still, were the question put to any student (actual or prospective) of the Catholic University, "Which would you prefer,—a London degree, or none at all?" the student would probably select the former alternative.

It appears, then, that out of the four possible academical degrees enumerated, one (that of the Queen's University) is beyond the reach of the students in Stephen's Green, as the law at present stands; another (that of Trinity) is unavailable, if for no other, for economical reasons; a third (that of the London University), though accessible, is open to grave objection; while the fourth it would upon various accounts

be most impolitic to attempt to confer at present. Is there now any preferable fifth alternative, which the promoters of the cause of Catholic education might hope, by a reasonable exercise of prudence and energy, to obtain?

It seems to us that there is; and it is this. Why should not an arrangement be aimed at for the Catholic University of Ireland analogous to that which works so admirably at Louvain? Let there be a mixed board of examiners for academical degrees, one half Catholics and the other half Protestants, appointed by the Lord Lieutenant (subject, as to the Catholic members, to the approval of the Bishops), and empowered to grant degrees in arts, law, medicine, and science, to students who had matriculated in any of the Universities of England or Ireland, and followed there a prescribed course of instruction. This might be effected by an act of parliament, which, if introduced, as it ought to be, by an Irish member, and one of their own supporters, the present Liberal government could only by the extremest illiberality oppose. Such an act would, in fact, furnish Ireland, but in a better way, with a machinery which, under its new regulations, the London University supplies for England. A valuable *Irish* degree, recognised by the state, by the law, and by society, would thus be accessible to the students of the Catholic University (for it need hardly be said, that in the schedule attached to the act, enumerating the Universities contemplated under its provisions, the Catholic University would of course be included), while no humiliating condition would be imposed, no sacred principle tampered with. Into the details of such a plan it is unnecessary to enter; they could be easily arranged, if the principle were adopted and acted upon.

A plan so simple and so equitable, if zealously promoted by Catholic educationists (especially if organised in some society such as the "Catholic Education Society" proposed in the late number of the *Dublin Review*), would probably, even if opposed at first, ultimately win its way to general acceptance. Indeed, it may be presumed that the venerated prelates who watch over the interests of the University will certainly never rest contented with a settlement *less* advantageous than this. Whether, as a temporary expedient to meet the case of the present students, and of those who may enter the University before a final settlement has been obtained, it might not be advisable to make arrangements with the London University with the view of bringing, under their recent regulations, their B.A. degree within the reach of the students in Stephen's Green, is perhaps a question deserving

of consideration. Doubtless the whole subject will be duly weighed in the proper quarter.

To recapitulate what has been said,—the whole future of the Catholic University seems to be bound up with these two main requirements, the appointment of a rector, and the adjustment of some plan whereby the students can obtain degrees. If the foregoing observations shall be found to throw any light on these questions, and on the best mode of dealing with them, our object will have been fully attained.

---

---

### REFORM.

THE contemptuous apathy with which the Reform Bill has been received is not encouraging to those who would write about it; but the bill itself involves such momentous consequences, that those who have something to say upon them, and the opportunity of saying it, can scarcely allow the occasion to slip by unused. It would be an everlasting reproach to the present generation, if, through their imbecile sloth or lordly carelessness, they were to allow the constitution of their country to be changed without having first satisfied themselves, with the utmost circumspection and care, that the alteration is requisite for the national safety, and that it still leaves safeguards enough to guarantee the continuance of the constitution for generations to come.

We cannot say that the apathy of the House of Commons has been compensated by the activity of the press. The question has been discussed as a matter of propriety, but not as a subject of interest. If critics have entered into the judgment-hall, it was only *ut viderent finem*—to get it over and have done with it. Even the organs of parties and classes which consider the bill to be fatal to their interests have written as if they thought it fated. There has been no organic attempt to defeat it, or even to counteract the injuries it threatens. It was enough to grumble at the bill, and sneer at the intrigues of its author. There has been no contrition expressed by the Tories for their follies; and yet they have led us into our present dilemma: first, by their refusal of the small reforms demanded in 1827; next, by their revengeful desertion of Wellington and Peel after the passing of Catholic emancipation; then by their “damnable iteration” of the same gross blunder after the repeal of the corn-laws in 1845; and lastly, by their tricky appropriation of a

principle which they were born to oppose in their bill of last year. There has been no exhortation to the nation to gird up its loins for a struggle. The middle classes have been told to accept with resignation the inevitable stroke that must disinherit them; and have been only taught to revenge themselves with epigrams and jokes, like the nobleman "beggared by fools" of whom Dryden writes:

"He had his jest, and they had his estate."

If the classes that have hitherto governed the country have really become so sapless and effete as to put up with this exchange; if they have been crammed with comic grammars and comic histories, comic preaching and prayer-books adapted to the stage, till they have become like the mockers to whom Mahomet addressed the Koran text, "The heavens and the earth, and all that they contain, think ye that we have made them in jest?" if they really have become only politicians in play, only capable of looking at the Reform Bill as a pleasantry, or an unpleasant practical joke,—then certainly it is time to admit some streams of fresh blood into our governing classes.

Our statesmen and our representatives seem to feel their burden to be too heavy for their shoulders; not that they stand apart, like the gods of Epicurus, and lazily watch the everlasting machine roll on: they are willing enough to put their shoulders to the wheel; late sittings and committees all day they will attend with most praiseworthy assiduity. But the one thing that they are required to do, that they shrink from undertaking. They find it easier to do than to determine, to act than to think; therefore they wish to let matters settle themselves. No one will seize the rudder—none will give orders for shifting the sails; but every one will lay hold of the rope nearest him, and haul away with hearty good will. They have judged themselves to be more capable of labour than of the direction of labour; and thus they have almost confessed their incapacity for government. Under the double burden of a sense of incapacity and a desire to fulfil their responsibilities, men will generally seek to lessen their labours by a process of simplification. As popular Protestant theology is reduced to a shallow fiction, which "he who runs may read," and which, indeed, can only be read running,—for a moment's pause to meditate would reveal its nakedness,—so popular politics are simplified down to the merest rudiments. Under the manipulation of our present politicians, our constitution would be deprived of its high human organisation, and would be simplified into a homogeneous mass of similar cells.

All advance in organisation implies differentiation of parts; all real reform implies that encouragement of the growing members, and that discouragement of the decaying parts, that tends to the greatest development of the one, and the necessary lopping away of the other. In this process there is no necessary simplification: the growing members may be as different as possible; the decaying ones may be all alike; the tendency may be to wider and wider differentiation, and to increased speciality in each part, and not to generalisation and homogeneousness.

And here, as it appears to us, was the great error of the first Reform Bill. Up to that time, both the practice of the constitution and the theory of the greatest political writers recognised the principle of representing all conflicting interests in the deliberative assembly of the nation. "Conflicting interests," says Burke, "interpose a salutary check to all precipitate resolutions: they render deliberation not a matter of choice, but of necessity; they make all change a subject of compromise, which naturally begets moderation; they produce temperaments, preventing the sore evil of harsh, crude, unqualified reformatorys, and rendering all the headlong exertions of arbitrary power, in the few or in the many, for ever impracticable." Various boroughs had various constituencies; their laws varied from well-nigh universal suffrage to selection by a close corporation. And before the reform agitation of 1832, the best Whig authorities considered this variety of constituencies to be one of the great safeguards of the constitution, and deprecated uniformity of suffrage as a degradation towards either oligarchy or democracy. "A uniform qualification must be so high as to exclude true popular election, or so low as to be liable to most of the objections which lie against universal suffrage." Thus wrote Sir James Mackintosh, in 1818, in his admirable essay on "The Right of Parliamentary Suffrage."\* "Variety," he continues, "by giving a very great weight to property in some elections, enables us safely to allow an almost unbounded scope to popular feeling in others. While some have fallen under the influence of a few great proprietors, others border on universal suffrage. All the intermediate varieties and all their possible combinations find their place." Even Lord John Russell, in 1821, expressed the same opinion. "All parts of the country and all classes of the people ought to have a share in elections. . . . In proportion to the general freedom of the community will be the discontent excited in the deprived class by the sentence of nullity and inactivity pronounced upon them.

\* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xxxi., and *Works*, vol. iii. p. 205.



Every system of uniform suffrage, except universal, contains this dark blot; and universal suffrage, in pretending to avoid it, gives the whole power to the highest and lowest, to money and to multitude, and thus disfranchises the middle classes." And he concludes, that though every class ought to have an influence in elections, it is not necessary to give every member of every class a vote; that is to say, different classes might be made to preponderate in different places by a varying qualification.

The revolutionary character of the Reform Bill of 1832 consisted solely (as we think) in going so far towards abolishing this variety,—in giving us a uniform qualification instead of the different ones which we had. We suppose that the desire for simplicity was at the foundation of this error. Simplicity, no doubt, is a very necessary quality of the machinery of elections. But the simplicity of this machinery does not depend upon its being every where the same. It is doubtless best that steam-engines should be simple; but a steam-engine at Manchester does not spoil the working of another engine at Liverpool because it happens to be made after a different model. In like manner, it is not necessary for the simplicity of an election at York that it should be conducted precisely in the same manner as an election in Surrey, and by voters with the same qualification. Simplicity of machinery was not the real object sought in 1832. Simplification of the work of parliament was the real reason for the levelling process that was adopted; and this process was rendered necessary by the principles of reform that were then held. During many previous years, piecemeal reforms had been proposed; and the rejection of these had led to the agitation which necessitated the wholesale measure; and the wholesale measure necessitated the adoption of political principles which were and are quite contrary to the whole tenor of the constitution. A wholesale measure must be uniform, universal, and must do all it has to do at once. It is opposed to the principle of variety; and "a variety of rights of suffrage," says Mackintosh, "is the principle of English representation;"—it must be universal, extending to all constituencies; and it must alter them all at once, as if the constitution had become as jointless and decrepit as Wordsworth's old Cumberland beggar, who must "move altogether if he move at all." But as a very few of these wholesale alterations would soon bring us to the furthest possible limit,—to manhood-suffrage,—it is always necessary to proclaim the finality of the present measure,—to declare that it is enough for years or generations to come, if not for ever. Lord John Russell

made himself quite notorious for his promise that the Reform Bill of 1832 went as far as reform could ever go. It was to be final, and was thus to destroy the old constitutional principle of a standing law for the continual adjustment of the representation to the variations of constituencies. The simplicity which was considered necessary for the bill caused the changes made to be uniform, universal, contemporaneous, and (it was said) final; thereby obscuring the variety of the old constituencies, rendering needlessly difficult the partial changes which from time to time may become necessary, and doing away with that standing vital force of continual self-adjustment which ought to be a characteristic of the constitutions of all states; for "a state," says Burke, "without the means of some change, is without the means of its conservation."

It appears, therefore, to us, that the true mission of the reformers of 1860 is, to restore the principles which were obscured by those of 1832 against their better judgment, as expressed in times of less excitement. "We ought not," said Mackintosh, in 1821, "to exchange our diversified elections for any general qualification." We require, then, that the fact should be recognised, that the simplicity which is wanted is not a simplicity in the statute, which necessarily implies uniformity in all the elections, but a simplicity of election in each place, which is compatible with the greatest variety in different places, and consequently with the greatest intricacy of the statute-book. We do not want to lighten the labours of our representatives, but merely to provide that in each constituency the electors should be selected on the simplest possible rules. We want variety of constituencies instead of their present uniformity, and therefore we want a reform diametrically opposed to that of the government bill. Secondly, we want the principle of finality explicitly renounced, as it is implicitly by the introduction of the bill, and the old constitutional principle expressly recognised, that there should be a standing law of continual self-adjustment in the state. We cannot conceive a state in which reform is not a normal condition of progress, that is, of existence; of a progress which need not be change, but simply growth. "The course of true wisdom," says Mackintosh, "would have been [to enact] a law which, acting quietly, calmly, but constantly, would have removed or prevented all gross inequality in the representation." Thirdly, we want the fact to be recognised, that variety in qualifications is necessary for the representation of classes; and that these various qualifications must be local: if this was once recognised, we should have no difficulty in finding places where each class might with all certainty

elect its own representatives. There might be places where the shipping interest is all-powerful, others where the manufacturing interests, others where the Stock Exchange commands the poll, others where the working-man is certain of securing the return of his delegates. But to secure this variety, it is necessary that we should give up the hallucination that all reforms must equally affect all constituencies at once. The time is gone by for us to fear a revolutionary reform agitation; in 1832 it was necessary to patch up the rent at once with cloth of any colour. The measure was not only a reformation, but a conciliation also; the occasion was too urgent for delay and circumspection. Then the argument that it was necessary to shut up the agitation as soon as possible was the master-key of the controversy; it was needful to finish the business out of hand, and have done with it; it was too hot to hold. But it has cooled now; we may take it in our hands, and examine it as curiously as we please, without fear of burning our fingers; there is no hurry. Still the business must be begun, and begun *bonâ fide*, or we may soon have an agitation. There was a lull before the bill of 1832; in 1827, Lord Althorp, the leader of the Whigs in the House of Commons, told Sir R. Peel that the people had become so indifferent to reform, that he never intended to bring forward the question again. Since 1823, only fourteen petitions in its favour had been presented; and Mr. Roebuck admits,\* that the agitation of 1831, instead of being the spontaneous result of popular feeling, "was, in fact, brought about by the incessant labours of a few industrious and shrewd partisans, forming a secret, but very active and efficient, committee in London." Though there are no such abuses extant now as served for a foundation for the agitation at that time, yet no one can tell how soon a similar movement may be propagated; and if it is just that each class should have its representatives in the House, it is clear that the sooner the working classes have their due amount of representation, the better it will be for the rest of us.

But though the measure must be begun at once, there is no reason why it should be finished at once. In 1830, the reform question was a running sore; it would have been as mischievous to keep it open as to prevent an ulcer on the human body from healing. But now it has lost all morbid symptoms, and reform can be nothing worse than a health-preserving issue. Provided that it retains this healthy character, there can be no more harm in an annual or biennial reform bill than in the annual debates on the Budget, or than in

\* *Hist. of Whig Ministry*, vol ii. p. 309.

Mr. Spooner's motions, which amuse him, and do not hurt us. We wish, then, to get rid of the feeling, which is founded on the timidity of one party and on the swagger of the other, that it is necessary to frame at once a comprehensive measure, and to have done with it, so as to set the question at rest for a season, and to give us some years' breathing-time before we have a further inroad of the inevitable democracy.

If it is true that no constitution is perfect which does not contain in itself a power of responding to changes of condition, and of gradually reforming itself so as to satisfy the requirements of a progressive population, it follows, *ex vi termini*, that reforms should be gradual, put together piece by piece as they are wanted, and applied where they are wanted, not forced on a reluctant portion of the commonwealth because they are required for another part of the kingdom. Instead of dealing with all the kingdom at once, each place should be dealt with separately: this was all that was asked in 1827; and if it had not been for the ill-advised opposition of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel to the enfranchisement of Birmingham, we should now have in operation the principle of gradual enfranchisement of boroughs, and of classes in particular boroughs, instead of our having still to hope to see the principle established.

After we have once recognised that reform is a continuously acting law, not visiting us, like earthquakes or revolutions, by intervals and catastrophes, but continually readjusting our practice to our principles, we shall lose all love for a comprehensive bill, and all fear even of so extravagant a project as a standing committee of the House to watch over the births and deaths of constituencies, to determine when this borough is moribund, and when that town is worthy to be erected into a borough; and further, to consider to what class the influence of the place belongs, and to recommend parliament so to rule the qualification of its constituents as to secure the predominance of that class in its elections. We will consider the objections to this plan further on; here we have to enumerate two important benefits that would follow at once from its adoption.

The first of these benefits is, the multiplication of the steps which lead us down the incline which ends in the level of democracy. If we descend by strides as wide as those which Lord John Russell's giant legs can take with such facility, we shall find ourselves citizens of a democratic republic like America, or of a revolutionary empire like France, within two generations. Between the qualification of the Reform Bill of 1832 and pure democracy there are only ten degrees

for the boroughs, and fifty for the counties ; Lord John Russell at one stride carries us down four of the ten steps, and forty out of the fifty. One more such a tumble, and we are at zero. That with a serene sky above us, and warm air around us, our political barometer should make such a fearful fall, indicates rather a breakage in the instrument, or incompetence in the managers of it, than any real tempest brewing in the elements. If we adhered to the system of universal uniformity of suffrage, it would be difficult to moderate this headlong descent. An eight or nine pound qualification would be considered as too small a concession, and might produce the very agitation which we so much dread ; moreover it would not do that which the present Reform Bill is required to do, namely, give the working classes a fair representation in parliament. But if we returned to the variety we formerly possessed, then the downward steps might be multiplied almost indefinitely. For each reform would only apply to the place for which it was intended, and it might require a hundred sessions to legislate for a hundred boroughs.

The second benefit is, the field that is at once open to us for trying the many plausible plans which statesmen and eminent political thinkers have devised for guaranteeing the stability of our class-representation. With universal uniformity, only one of these experiments can be tried, and when it is once determined upon, it will be irrevocable, whatever its ill effects or its unexpected consequences. With the restoration of variety, every one of the plans may find its fitting place. If three members are given to the West Riding, an attempt may be made to give the minority a voice, by giving only two votes to each elector. If three are given to Manchester, the experiment of the cumulative vote may be tried there. Elsewhere, the electors may vote by voting-papers, as they vote for guardians, and the provisions of Sturges Bourne's act may be applied to the election of members of parliament. In another place, Hume's proposal of primary and secondary electors may be put to the test of practice. In other places, the "fancy" franchises may be set up. Even the forlorn ballot might find a place for the sole of its foot. There is no end to the possibilities of experiment, as soon as the principle of variety of franchise is acknowledged to be essential to the stability of class-representation.

To all this it may be objected, what is the House of Commons, that it should thus sport with the rights of the people ? Either the parliament derives its powers from the people it represents, or it does not. If it derives its powers from the

people, it does not appertain to its functions to determine what sections of the people it will represent; the people as a whole has a right to be represented, and the qualification must go upon general laws, so as to be the same every where, not to be jobbed and manipulated, here rounded and there squared, at the fancy of the leaders of parliament, in order to preserve the balance of parties pretty much as it exists at present. The principle of variety of qualification in various places would at once open the gates to a whole deluge of jobs, and jobs would beget discontents, whose consequences in the long run would be much more dangerous than the effects of a general lowering of the franchise in all places at once. On the other hand, if the parliament does not derive its powers from the people it represents, the representative system is a mere hoax, and the question of reform a sham.

It would be endless to discuss the question of the rights of the people. If the franchise is among these rights, we ought, consistently, to admit that an article of property is a legitimate article of sale. If the supremacy in the country is to be given to voters who are saleable, it will perhaps go some way to restore the balance in favour of property, if we make provision that they should be actually sold. But to argue seriously. Among the rights of every freeman we must reckon his liberty, and his security of person and property. All persons may have equal rights, though not to equal things. The person who buys a shilling's-worth of bread has as much right to what he buys as the person who buys a hundred pounds'-worth. The person who pays twenty pounds in taxation has not twenty times more right to supervise the disbursement of taxes than he who pays one pound; but he has an equal right to twenty times more weight in the disposition of it. He is oppressed if those who pay less than he have more influence than he in spending the funds which he contributes. All have a right to equal securities for freedom, for justice, for the means of procuring temporal prosperity; all have a right to have their local interests attended to. Each man, whether he has the franchise or not, ought to know and feel that he is free, but not free dangerously to himself or others: he ought to be assured, that if he acts as he is bound to act, no power on earth can touch his life, his liberty, or his property; he ought to possess that inward and dignified consciousness of his own security and independence which alone constitutes the proud and comforting sentiment of freedom; he ought also to know and rejoice in his safe mediocrity; he should be glad to think, that though he had the talents of a Napoleon, he cannot, by favour of prince

or people, elevate himself above a given line, so as to endanger his own or his country's ruin ; he should love the order which keeps things fast in their places ; he should consider it made to him, and he to it ; he should as soon think of asking for another body and another mind, as another order in which to live.

This is very good morality, but unfortunately it does not carry conviction with it. For the ruling classes to hold such language to the unenfranchised, appears like a full belly preaching patience to the lank hungry one that barks for food. It will not do to forget that the love of power is as natural and as much a fact as the love of freedom. Free people not only desire to be well ruled, but to rule, and to express their own opinion. The unenfranchised part of the population in 1832 had no particular oppression to complain of ; they were as well off as their enfranchised neighbours. But they wanted power as well as freedom. They wished not merely that the nation should be well governed, but that they should govern it. Many of them succeeded in attaining their desires, and it was lucky that they did ; no amount of the very best government would have induced them to forego their wish for another thirty years. Whether the change was for better or worse, some change was unavoidable ; if some useful principles were sacrificed in the hurry, we have only to thank those whose stubborn opposition to partial reforms goaded the people to refuse to be satisfied with any but a comprehensive measure.

The right of the people to the franchise, then, is dependent upon these two other rights : the right to be well governed, and the right to have a hand in the government. As the unenfranchised classes have been, and may still be, well governed, the first clause does not help our argument much. The second divides itself into two heads, according to the twofold function of the House of Commons. The House arose as the imposer and the guardian of taxes ; and it has advanced to be the supreme council of the empire in all matters of government. As far as it is a taxing body, every man has a right to representation therein, in proportion to the amount of the taxes that he pays. As far as it is the organ of the imperial government, every man may claim a representative influence therein, proportionate to his political capacity ; and here the principle holds good, that "every person has a right to so much political power as he can exercise without impeding any other person who would more fitly exercise that power." The two functions of our parliamentary representatives require two different qualifications in their constituents. The taxing function requires a property qualification ; the political

function, a political qualification. Rich tax-payers would be highly injured if their taxes were levied and spent only by needy politicians; and needy politicians might be equally aggrieved by the timidity and want of energy of a government of rich tax-payers. They would suffer like the poor in unions where none but tenant-farmers are guardians. In spite of the doctrine of theorists, that property qualification is the best test of political capacity, it is the possible, the supposed, or the apparent discrepancy between the rights of property and the rights of political capacity that gives rise to all the difficulties of reform.

We are convinced that this discrepancy will never be reduced by any general equalising measure. On the contrary, every further reduction of qualification gives more power to the needy classes, and takes it away from those who have property. In order to satisfy the claims of wealth as well as the claims of capacity (or supposed capacity), a most complicated system, similar to that of Sturges Bourne's act, would probably be requisite; and this complexity, being found, not in the statute-book, but in the registration-office and in the polling-booth, would be a much more fatal error against simplicity than any possible variety of franchises in various places. Besides, it would not answer its political object. It would not satisfy those classes whose supposed discontent is the motive for the measure: they would, as Mr. Bright says, consider any such classification as a degradation; and the measure being universal, if it gave the working men power any where, it would give it them every where, and so fail in its object of preventing the reduction of the kingdom to a democracy; or, if it gave them power nowhere, it would only dissatisfy them the more on account of the imposition which they would consider had been practised upon them.

If no universal homogeneous measure can reconcile the discrepancy between the rights of property and those of political capacity, partial measures, with varieties of qualifications, evidently can do so. In a nation of 30,000,000 of inhabitants, men must be content to be lumped together in classes, and must learn to identify the interests of their class with their own. "To be attached to the subdivision," says Burke, "to love the little platoon we belong to in society, is the first principle, the germ of public affections." Men must be content if their class is adequately represented, though they may not be represented as individuals. The gentlemen and rich tradesmen of Marylebone must acquiesce in being swamped by the ten-pound voters, provided that their classes are sure of returning their representatives elsewhere.



We must understand, then, that if the class to which a man belongs is properly represented in parliament, he himself must be considered to be sufficiently represented, though in his own borough his individual vote is hopelessly smothered beneath those of a great opposing majority. This rule applies as much to the labouring classes as to any other. Numerically they are every where in a majority. To enfranchise them universally would be to place all power in their hands, and to disfranchise every other class. To lower the franchise universally, but only so as to enfranchise a few of the upper strata of the working classes, would not be sufficient to give them a representation. If they were left in a minority, their candidates would still be beaten; if they were to constitute a majority, we should wake and find ourselves a republic. The only remaining plan is to enfranchise the class, but not all the members of the class; to enfranchise it in some great towns, where it is most powerful and its opinions are most marked, and to take care that its influence does not spread so as to swallow up that of all the rest. The working classes are more homogeneous than any other. If the Duke of Wellington feared the first Reform Bill because the lower strata of the middle classes represented by the 10% householders were the most apt of all to form combinations and unions apart, what would he have said to the strata which Lord John Russell would now enfranchise, who have proved their powers of combination, not to mention their advanced socialistic opinions by the late strike? The unity of the working classes is the most terrible warning against the present Reform Bill. Mackintosh has some remarks upon this point that are worthy of all consideration: "The labouring classes are in every country a perpetual majority. . . . Notwithstanding local differences, persons in this situation have a general resemblance of character and sameness of interest. Their interest, or what they think their interest, may be at variance with the real or supposed interests of the higher orders. If they are considered as forming, in this respect, one class of society, a share in the representation may be allotted to them, sufficient to protect their interest compatibly with the equal protection of the interests of all other classes, and regulated by a due regard to all the qualities which are required in a well-composed legislative assembly. But if representation be proportioned to numbers alone, every other interest in society is placed at the disposal of the multitude. No other class can be effectually represented; no other class can have a political security for justice; no other can have any weight in the deliberations of the legislature.

No talents, no attainments, but such as recommend men to the favour of the multitude can have any admission into it. A representation so constituted would produce the same practical effects as if every man whose income was above a certain amount were excluded from the right of voting. It is of little moment to the proprietors whether they be disfranchised, or doomed, in every election, to form a hopeless minority." When the interests and sympathies of the working class are the same in all places, it is clear that representatives elected by one body of them are necessarily the exponents of the wishes of the remainder.

The unity and individuality of the working class, though it is an invincible argument against putting all power into its hands, is also a very strong reason why it should be fairly represented, both as an order of tax-payers, and as a class with a certain political capacity. As a mere numerical majority, it has no claim to the greatest share in the representation. The old practice was, to represent adequately the separate interests of classes and districts; but there are no traces of a representation founded on mere numbers. The ancient measure of right to representation was liability to taxation: on this ground an act was passed in the time of Henry VIII., enabling Durham to return members. "The inhabitants," says the act, "are liable to all payments, rates, and subsidies, equally with the inhabitants of other counties and boroughs, and are therefore concerned equally with them to have knights and burgesses in parliament." Still not all the taxable inhabitants were enfranchised, but only the freeholders and freemen. The members chosen by the part of the people were considered virtually to represent the whole. All districts and communities, all classes and interests, were considered to have a claim to representation, but not all individual men.

Burke is especially severe upon the principle of the representation of mere numbers: "'A million should prevail over a thousand.' True, if the constitution of a kingdom be a problem of arithmetic." But, he asks, "is every landmark of the country to be done away in favour of a geometrical and arithmetical constitution?" Numbers count for little; "nothing is a due and adequate representation of a state that does not represent its ability and its property." Of the consequences of a numerical representation, he says, "Those who attempt to level, never equalise: in all societies consisting of various descriptions of citizens, some description must be uppermost;" and where all men have equal power, the working classes, which are most united and least differentiated, must rule. But, says Burke, "servile artisans ought not to

suffer oppression from the state ; but the state suffers oppression, if such as they, either individually or collectively, are permitted to rule." We will finish our quotations with one that is singularly apposite to that foolish flattery of the working classes which has been so much in vogue of late years, but of which the strike went far to cure us: "Woe to the country that would condemn to obscurity that which should shed lustre on it; and that considers a low education, a mean contracted view of things, and a sordid mercenary occupation as a title to command." "In public councils," says Ben Jonson, "nothing is so unequal as the equality where votes are numbered, not weighed." It has been well said of uneducated constituents, that "those who cannot give good reasons for their votes, will probably vote for reasons which they are ashamed to give," just as a Hottentot is ashamed to tell a civilised man the secrets of his religion.

In answer, then, to the objection, that the House of Commons has no right to sport with the people, and to fix the various franchises at its fancy, we reply, that the House, as an integral portion of the supreme government of the empire, not only has the right, but is bound to distribute the franchise according to the principles of the constitution, and according to the capacity of the constituents. Endless, we know, is the jesting with which the St. Simonian formula, "to each according to his capacity," was received. "What business," asks Proudhon, "has the Père Enfantin to judge of my capacity? If I had the honour to belong to this Infantine Church, my first idea would be to box my pontiff's ears." But the House of Commons is neither a self-erected prophet like the Père Enfantin, nor does it pretend to judge of the capacities of individuals, but of classes. A great part of its judgment turns on the very patent capacities of the various classes to be taxed. And for the internal qualifications an external test is always demanded, such as a degree at the university, or the having come to years of discretion. "The wisdom of the people," says Pascal, "is shown in their distinguishing men by external marks, as nobility, riches, and dress. They are cannibals whom Montaigne makes so surprised at seeing bearded men do homage to an infant king. Would you elect the wisest or most virtuous? But each man is wisest and most virtuous. Therefore, choose the eldest male heir, and all is clear, without room for disputes. Peace, the greatest of goods, becomes easy." All classes, though the quality which gives them their place in the classification be intangible, may yet also be distinguished by some accidental external quality, of which account might be taken for the franchise, provided

that the classes are taken locally, and that no attempt be made to make a general division of the whole population into a few marked strata. The partitions of society should be, as it were, vertical, not horizontal. And these vertical divisions might be easily distinguished by some marked external characteristic.

In fixing on this characteristic, it must never be forgotten that fitness to govern is not an absolute quality, but a comparative one. A French private soldier might be commander-in-chief in Timbuctoo, without deserving to be a marshal of France. And because a Potter rules in the trades-union or a Stubbs in the village pot-house, it is no reason why the chair of the quarter-sessions should be offered to him. Where we can have better, the worse must be contented with inferior positions. No class, then, should be so enfranchised as in effect to disfranchise the rest; least of all should the class which pays least in taxes, which has least leisure, and consequently least political capacity, be made so predominant as to overshadow the richer and more educated classes. But it will not be enough to make mere accumulated wealth the sole test of qualification. Accumulated wealth gives no criterion of distinction between the growing and the stationary classes of the community. Now it is in the growing classes that the common life is most vigorous, and where consequently political capacity may be expected to be more largely developed. Every care, therefore, should be taken not to thwart the legitimate ambition of the prosperous and growing parts of the country, or these parts are forced into revolutionary ideas. All the Indian nabobs of Burke's day were Jacobins. The ambition of the newly-enriched man when checked is sure to run in this groove; it becomes discontented and evil-eyed, and loves to see things go backward. But rising ambition is rather busy than dangerous, and becomes a useful and healthy force when it is allowed a proper sphere of development. The Duke of Wellington said, in a debate on municipal reform, "As the people of England, since the original establishment of close corporations, have advanced in riches, in knowledge, and in their whole condition, it is natural that they should wish to participate in the administration of their own affairs." The growing portions of the community have a right to the opportunity for the exercise of their political talents. The stationary parts of the empire may retain what they can of their controlling power, but they should leave the progressive parts free to act, and, above all, free to express themselves in the great council of the nation.

We know that in advocating these principles of reform we

are going against what may be called the sectarian interests of the Catholics of the United Kingdom. We know that with universal suffrage, or even with a largely lowered franchise, the Catholics would form large bodies in many of the great towns of England, where their union and combination would soon render them as powerful a party as they are in the United States. We know also that the lower classes who would take the benefit of a lowering of the franchise, are generally much more favourable, or rather much less hostile, to Catholicity than the ten-pound householders usually are, among whom is chiefly to be found the traditional Puritanism which has survived from the Reformation to the present day. The strata beneath this are usually indifferent to all religion, and in many places even more favourably disposed to the Church than to any other form of Christianity. Among them, in the country parts, survive such sayings as, "We do know it was the old religion;" or, "It was the first, and it shall be the last;" while in several thickly populated districts, the priest is the only religious functionary who is always received with respect, and who can dare with security to penetrate into dens and alleys where the police are afraid to go. A comprehensive measure of reform would also inflict a due penalty on the classes to which we owe our three centuries of oppression, by crushing the Established Church. But, in spite of all these reasons, we would rather preserve the institutions of the empire in their integrity, than destroy them for a merely temporary selfish advantage. Besides, the fate of the Church, even in Catholic countries where universal suffrage is in vogue, is a sufficient warning against trusting too much to such mobs as those who extemporise the services of St. George's-in-the-East. At the present day, the power of secret combination has largely developed among the radical and so-called liberal sections of the people. Those who are attached to old institutions are so many units, who can only be got to act together at intervals, and by fits and starts. A largely lowered right of suffrage would put all power into the hands of agitators and demagogues. Now in the long run these people are not the most advantageous assistants that the Church can have, even if she could secure their allegiance. The clergy in Belgium have already begun to repent of 1830, and to regret the rule of the King of Holland. It is superfluous to speak of the present feelings of the clergy of France towards their elect of the 2d of December. The Church may always depend upon the people, but not on the people organised on the principles of a revolutionary democracy.

Our confidence in the bill before the House is not increased by seeing to whose hands it is confided. We do not forget the former performances of the great letter-writer of the present century. We do not forget that on the defeat of the second Reform Bill in the Lords, Oct. 8th, 1831, how popular violence was provoked by Lord John Russell's letter to the chairman of the Birmingham political union, in which he assured them, "that it was impossible for the whisper of a faction to prevail against the voice of the nation." Though he was afterwards forced to deny that the "faction" he meant was the House of Lords, and though within a month the ministry was obliged to proclaim the union to be an illegal body, yet for the moment the letter did its work; it made the mob believe that their excesses would not be unacceptable to their rulers. The riots of London, Derby, Nottingham, and Bristol followed. We pass over his letter on the repeal of the corn-laws to the electors of London, in 1845, in which he attempted to forestall the popularity of Peel, of whose measures he had obtained an inkling, and his celebrated Durham epistle of 1850, in which he treated the Catholics to an act of charity, similar in all respects to that which he had bestowed on the opponents of reform in 1831. These things have little to do with the merits of reform, but have much to do with the merits of the man, who has always shown himself so ready to raise and make use of a revolutionary excitement for the purpose of passing measures in which he takes a personal interest or has in any way engaged his reputation, that it would be the starkest madness in the classes which at present govern the country to trust their fate in his hands.

We have confined our arguments to the question of the restoration of variety of qualifications in various constituencies; the principle, though obscured by the reform act of 1832, is still living in the different qualifications for borough and county, and in the whole class of borough freemen. It may easily be restored and revived. Without it, we are confident, no general plan will succeed, neither representation of minorities, nor consolidated votes, nor fancy franchises, nor any other of the numerous proposals, all ingenious, all worthy to be tried on a small scale, but all inapplicable in a comprehensive universal measure.

---

## THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF THE POPES.—No. II.

IN our former article\* we intentionally omitted all mention of the States of the Church, because they not only formed no part of the European system of states which the Popes wished to found, but, as the patrimony of St. Peter, stood quite apart from the other states, like a stranger, whose mission it seemed to be to present a contrast to the uniformity of the rest, and to be a centre of peace and quietness, while the others made war and rapine their business. While all other states naturally result from the migrations of nations, the patrimony of St. Peter rests on essentially different bases. Rome is its nucleus; and though the city was sometimes overwhelmed with the overflow of the barbarians, and though portions of its territory were more than once absorbed by them, the migratory races never maintained a permanent settlement there. This kernel of the Papal power was not, as the superficial historians of France would have it, the gift of Pipin and Charlemagne; with whom the modern Emperors of the French have about as much in common as the wolf and the fox with the lion. They only extended the already existing ecclesiastical dominion to territories rescued from Lombard usurpation, or from the Church-enslaving chicanery of the Byzantine empire. The history of the States of the Church is quite independent of that of the Papal system of Europe, but runs parallel with that of the growth of the German empire, which found Rome the great obstacle to the attainment of a universal sovereignty. Before the German kings could receive the imperial crown, they were obliged to acknowledge the independence of the States of the Church; and when "the new Pilate," as Dante calls Philip the Fair, prevailed upon Clement V. to exchange Rome for Avignon, not only Rome, but the whole Church, fell into trouble and confusion, through the preponderance of France; for after the removal of the Roman chair, the French Cardinals plunged the Christian world into a schism that lasted nearly forty years, during which the States of the Church fell into a state of decomposition, from which it required the unremitting exertions of the Popes during the fifteenth century to rescue them.

These endless fluctuations induced the Popes to adopt the policy of endeavouring to exclude foreign influence from Italy, and of checking the preponderance of one power by the opposition of another. Protestant England is now

\* See p. 154 of our second volume.

charmed with the Italian policy of self-deliverance and self-emancipation, though introduced under the suspicious patronage of the despot of France. But the great Popes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had no other intentions than to make Italy a free country. If they failed, they had to thank Charles VIII. of France, who invaded Italy, overthrew the national governments of Milan, Florence, and the rest, and in union with Spain founded a hierarchy of powers which has not been improved by the expulsion of the Austrians. It was not German interference that produced the misfortunes of Italy. The Germans, for the most part, prevented the petty and destructive wars, and smothered the violent antipathies which always were smouldering between the different territories and towns. They pacified Italy. Her misfortunes for centuries have been due to the interference of the French, who were continually blowing the embers of discord, and, though incapable of rearing any lasting political edifice, or of maintaining themselves in the possession of the country, were always on the watch for opportunities of fomenting divisions among the unfortunate people. Over and over again they marched their armies across the Alps when Italy had risen to a flourishing and prosperous condition, only to leave it an impoverished and desolate ruin. But we will not anticipate.

The Crusades added new motives to those which had already induced nations and princes to recognise in the Pope not only their spiritual, but also their temporal chief. The holy war was undertaken under the direct protection and guidance of Rome. It brought the Catholics of the West and the centre into contact with the schismatical nations of eastern Europe; and, while it raised the renown of the Latin world, did no service to the Byzantine empire, whose internal decay had been daily becoming more glaring since the time of Manuel Comnenus. The Emperor Frederic Barbarossa's conduct of his crusade induced the Servians to offer him their crown; but the Hohenstaufen refused to erect another Germano-Sclavonic state (he had already set up Bohemia in 1158) behind the Magyars. Upon this, Pope Innocent III. undertook to organise the southern Sclavonians, and resolved to change Stephen the Servian Zupan into the apostolic king of the new state, and so to withdraw Servia from the Byzantine system and to unite it with the Latin world. This design, so rich in its promises for eastern Europe, was foiled by the jealousy of the Magyars. King Emerich of Hungary expelled the king-elect, to whom the Pope had already sent the insignia of royalty, and demanded that the Wulk whom



he had appointed in Serbia should be crowned instead. Upon this the Pope commissioned the Archbishop of Colocz to perform the ceremony; but it was never done. The Hungarians treated Serbia as they had treated Croatia. They wished to make their own country the centre of a circle of states in eastern Europe. They therefore saw with disgust the rise of a new Latin power between their empire and that of Constantinople; for Kalojohannes, the ruler of the new Bulgarian kingdom, had revived the plan of Boris, the Bulgarian prince of the ninth century, to separate from Byzantium, and to unite with the Western Empire, and had gone so far as to write to Innocent III. that he wished to become a servant (*servus*) of St. Peter and his Holiness. The Pope sent him a crown, and ordered him to prepare the Bulgarians to submit to the Latin Church. Emerich attempted also to foil this design, although the Pope, in order to secure the succession of his family to the Hungarian crown, had directed the Bishops to swear allegiance to his young son Ladislaus. Yet it was only a short time before Emerich's death, in August 1204, that the Pope's ambassador was permitted to pass through Hungary to Bulgaria. On the other hand, the Byzantines had vainly endeavoured to induce the Bulgarian prince to repair to their capital to be crowned, and had promised him a special (schismatic) patriarch for his new kingdom, which, they said, could not subsist without one. But the Bulgarians seemed at last to have opened their eyes to the fact that no good was to be expected from Constantinople. It happened, however, that as soon as the Bulgarians had joined the Papal system, the Greek schismatic empire became Latin and Catholic through the crusade of 1204, and so the motive which had induced Kalojohannes to join the Western Empire ceased to exist. Nevertheless, the Bulgarians bestowed on their new neighbours, the Latins of Constantinople, the same enmity which they had formerly shown to the Greeks.

The overthrow of the Greek government at Constantinople had only tormented the Popes with fresh cares, without improving the condition of the Holy Land. The Latin West had to defend the Latin Empire of the East, as well as the Christian government of Asia; its action, already divided, was further paralysed by the renewal of the wars between the Hohenstaufen and the Popes, when the sudden invasion of the Tartars obliged it to concentrate itself within its own boundaries. This was the Bulgarians' opportunity; now or never they might crush the Latin Empire at Constantinople, and make themselves masters of the Byzantine

world. They captured Baldwin I., the first Latin emperor of Constantinople, cut off his arms and legs, and threw him into a hole, where he was devoured by unclean birds; at the same time, the Emperor Frederic II., who owed so much to the protection given him, while king of Sicily, by Innocent III., and to the favour shown him in his rivalry as German king with Otho IV., made an alliance with Vatazes the Greek, the chief enemy of the Latins at Constantinople. Thus failed the high promise of 1204 to form in Bulgaria and Wallachia\* a counterpart of the apostolic kingdom of Hungary, through the overthrow of the Greek empire and the spread of the Latin Church in the eastern peninsula of southern Europe. In 1261, eight hundred Greeks penetrated through subterraneous passages into Constantinople, and overthrew the Latin Empire, "to the everlasting reproach of the Latin name." And now the Bulgarians invited the Mogul Tartars to help them against the restored Romaic dominion, as they had formerly fought the Latins with the aid of the Romaic Greeks. Against this danger the Byzantines sought the aid of the Ottomans, while the Bulgarians looked as far as Egypt for friends in the Mamelukes, but to no purpose; they had at last to submit to Amurath, and have ever since repented at leisure their insincerity and fickleness in the matter of their annexation to the West.

The new system of states perished for want of a leader. The Popes, whether remaining in Rome, or at least in Italy, or whether seeking refuge in France from the German emperors, could not act like generals or victorious monarchs. From the first their system had borne the stamp of a voluntary submission. The consequences were disastrous. Thus in Poland, the Peter's pence were paid when the coinage, which was changed three times every year, had become most depreciated. Innocent III. was obliged to censure this proceeding as early as 1207. In 1246, the Russian Prince Daniel of Halicz, whose rule extended from the mouths of the Danube to beyond the Dnieper, placed himself under the protection of the Holy See, and was made king by the authority of Innocent IV. But in three years better times came, and Daniel did not hesitate to fall away. Again, in 1256, the Lithuanian Prince Mendaz (Mendanus, Mindane) applied to the Holy See, and Innocent IV. received him under his protection, and ordered the Bishop of Kulm to crown him king of Lithuania. Soon afterwards Mendaz became a for-

\* Kalojohannes wrote to the Pope: "Et ita habeat imperium meum justitias Bulgariae et Vlachiae, quod rex Ungariae habet justitias Ungariae." Raynaldus, 1204, 31.

midable patron of paganism, and thus the extension of the Christian system to Lithuania and Galicia was strangled in its birth. This was just a case in which a temporal head of the system of states might have called on the secular powers that owed him fealty to support his authority. But the Pope was obliged to think first of the conversion of these people, and could not defend his temporal authority by means which would have frustrated its principal object. Thus towards the end of the thirteenth century, the east of Europe was nearly in the same position as it had been at the beginning, before the Servians and Bulgarians had entered into negotiations with Rome. In the middle of the century, the Mongols invaded Russia, and disabled her, and thus saved the Catholic Slavonians from Russian intrusion; but they also broke the power of Poland, and turned Hungary into a desert. From this time, the history of these two nations begins almost anew; both needed a fresh population. Poland received numbers of German colonists, and the Pope was obliged to erect it into a kingdom to defend it against Wenceslaus II. of Bohemia, and to protect Hungary from an invasion of the Germans under Rudolph of Hapsburg. At this time, the above-mentioned Daniel of Halicz had submitted to the Holy See, and there was a prospect of uniting Bosnia by stronger ties to the Latin political system. But the breaking out of the last great struggle between the Popes and the Hohenstaufen dashed all these hopes. Bosnia became the seat of the Patrenes, a wide-spread and pernicious sect, which carried on a deadly war against the Catholic Church in the towns of Italy. Pope John XIII. vainly invoked the aid of the Emperor Frederic the Fair, King John of Bohemia, King Wladislaus Lokietek of Poland, and King Charles Robert of Hungary, against the Servians, who at times made as though they desired union with Rome, while they prevented the Byzantine empire from recovering its strength, and at last assisted the Ottomans to consummate the fall of Constantinople.

While the Slavonians of eastern Europe, after failing to secure a common centre in the empire, like the Germans, seemed to be seeking the same end by union with Rome, a similar attempt was being made in western Europe.

The kingdom of Arragon had become a model of chivalry. It was governed by its high nobility (*ricos hombres*) more than by the king. The reigning monarch received knight-hood on his marriage, or on his attaining the age of twenty years; this was all the coronation he received. In the hierarchy of the state, he was only first among his equals. This order of things was innovated upon by Don Pedro I., who

went to Rome in 1204, and was anointed by the Cardinal Archbishop of Porto, and afterwards crowned by Innocent III. in S. Pancrazio. After his coronation, the king proceeded to St. Peter's, where he laid his sceptre and crown on the altar of the Apostle, received his knight's sword from the Pope's hands, and in return gave to St. Peter his kingdom as a tributary state in perpetuity, in confident hope that Innocent and his successors would ever defend it by their apostolic authority. The Pope ordered that the coronation of all future kings of Arragon should be performed at Saragossa, by the Archbishop of Taragon.

This step of Don Pedro is sufficiently accounted for by the danger which menaced Christian Spain from the quarter of the Al-mohades, and by his wish to emancipate the crown from the influence of the grandees. The step was successful; for when Mahomet Ben Nasser, Emir al Mumenim, was preparing the formidable expedition of 1212, which was to crush Christian Europe, Pope Innocent summoned the Provençales, the French, the Germans, and the Italians to defend Spain. One hundred and eighty-five thousand Saracenic knights, and countless infantry, marched into Africa. On the 16th of July 1212, the battle of Nares de Tolosa was fought, and decided the fate of Europe and Africa. Spain was completely victorious, and Africa was depopulated. The victory was celebrated in Arragon as a triumph of the cross. Valencia, Cordova, and Seville threw off the yoke of the Al-mohades, and rendered the victory of the Christians more easy. Their superiority was decided for ever. But the next year brought evil days to Arragon; Don Pedro led an expedition to Toulouse to aid Count Raymond against Simon de Montfort, the conqueror of the Albigenes. The Spanish king was defeated and slain at Mures; his son, Don Jayme, after being educated by Simon at Carcasson, took possession of the throne of Arragon, and received homage as early as 1214.

The first care of Honorius IV. for his young vassal was, to prevent him declaring war on Simon de Montfort to avenge his father's death; the second step of the Pope was to summon the Spanish princes to assist Don Jayme in his struggles with the Moors. This step carved out the course for the heroic *Conquistador*, and made him one of the most significant figures of the middle ages. As early as 1225 he had forced the King of Valencia and Mursia to become tributary. In 1229 he conquered Majorca, upon which Minorca submitted, and Iviza was overcome. Then came the great blow against Valencia, and the annexation of that rich and flourishing kingdom to the crown of Arragon. Don Jayme,

the Pope's vassal, wrested eastern Spain from the Moors, while Ferdinand of Castile drove back the infidels of the interior as far as Granada.

The early part of the thirteenth century, which witnessed these important events in the east and west of Europe, displayed equally stirring scenes in Southern Italy. The Sicilian crown of the Hohenstaufen would have been lost after Henry's death, if Innocent III., as feudal lord, had not protected the rights, as well as the person, of the boy Frederic, not only against the German princes, whom Henry VI. had invested with Italian fiefs, but also against Walter Count of Brienne, who was about to become the husband of the eldest sister of the Norman King Henry III., and against Frederic's uncle Philip of Swabia and his adversary Otho the Guelph, whom, however, Innocent crowned emperor. This great Pope's policy was always to keep the German crown, the highest political power of Christendom, apart from the Sicilian crown, the fief of the Holy See. He bestowed the first on Otho the Guelph, and the second upon Frederic the Ghibelline: the first was reorganised by restoring the suffrage of the German princes, and renewing the emperor's power in Central Italy; the second by securing the succession of the crown, limiting the ecclesiastical privileges that had been granted by Adrian to King William, fixing the annual feudal tribute, and establishing the canonical election of Bishops, thereby, as Innocent hoped, cutting off all occasions of future ecclesiastical disputes between the Pope as feudal lord and the king as his vassal.

And now the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins had, it was hoped, slain and buried the schismatical system of states for ever and ever. This event induced Otho to reverse, as far as he could, all the regulations of Innocent III. He violated his oath, and even attacked Frederic II. in his hereditary dominions; a feat that drew upon him the excommunication of Innocent, and so caused the Hohenstaufen faction in Germany to raise the young king of Sicily, who had before been German king, to the imperial throne of his father.

In this crisis, the Holy See, as suzerain, still adhered to the policy of keeping distinct the imperial from the Papal circle of states; though with respect to Armenia an apparent exception is to be found in the fact, that the Pope ordered Leo to be crowned king of that country in 1199, by the Archbishop of Mayence, in the joint names of the Pope and emperor.

When Frederic II. became German king, he promised to

emancipate his eldest son Henry, and to make him king of Sicily. If he had fulfilled his promise when he became emperor, the house of Hohenstaufen might have been saved from its conflicts with the Church, and its two lines in Germany and Sicily might have risen to vast importance. But the emperor was faithless to his promise; he brought his son from Sicily into Germany, where he caused him to be clandestinely crowned German king, while he himself usurped the government of Sicily. In order to succeed in this political trick, he was obliged to involve himself in engagements to Germany as well as to Rome, which weakened the empire, and at last placed him in the unpleasant dilemma of either appearing a manifest perjurer, or else of leading a crusade to the East. The first effect was a rupture with the Pope (Gregory IX.); and when this was composed, another arose with his own son, who was no more at ease on German ground than his father could be. This dispute ended in the emperor's deposing his eldest son, abolishing the rights of primogeniture, and thus depriving his grandsons by Henry of the succession, and raising his second son Conrad to the German throne. Then came the establishment of absolutism in Italy, which had to be effected by violence, and by strongholds filled with Saracenic guards. This led to new ruptures with the Popes, who could not but condemn Frederic's doings in Sicily, which he ransacked and ruined, and deprived of its privileges, while he imprisoned its prelates and nobles. Sicily was impoverished by his tyranny, and Central and Upper Italy were split into the two factions of Guelphs and Ghibellines, who fought for life or death. There can be no doubt that Frederic, the vassal-king of Sicily, by his continual efforts, in spite of all his oaths, to undo the relations of his kingdom with the Holy See, ruined Frederic the Emperor and the whole imperial house of Hohenstaufen. His impatience of the state of vassalage was the parent of an insincerity which soon degenerated into utter faithlessness. He rejected all offers of reconciliation; and the result was, that the Council which he had himself convoked to decide between him and Gregory IX., but which he afterwards forcibly prevented from meeting, pronounced him to be guilty of perjury, and of violating the allegiance of a vassal, in 1245. He had begun as a priests' king, and he was ending as a persecutor of the Church! But his ruin might have been still delayed, if he had not obstinately adhered to the unnatural union of Sicily with Germany, and if he had not bequeathed to his son Conrad, in 1245, a system which had proved his own ruin. Innocent IV. summoned Sicily to vindicate her li-

berty, and his call has been echoing and reëchoing there ever since. In its best days, the house of Hohenstaufen was divided against itself, and these intestine broils were only aggravated in the days of its decay. Conrad IV.'s death was mysteriously sudden, as were the deaths of Frederic's other sons and grandsons. Men began to whisper about treason and assassination. The Emperor Manfred excluded Conrad II. (Conradin) from his inheritance of the crown of Sicily, which he usurped for himself by spreading a false report of his nephew's death, just as the Emperor Philip Hohenstaufen had served his nephew Frederic. Manfred's unfortunate sons, the last of the Hohenstaufen, perished in the dungeons of Charles of Anjou early in the fourteenth century. Peter of Arragon, the husband of their sister Constance, was too knowing to demand their liberty, and so to bar his wife's claims to Sicily. It was the unexpected vacancy of the Sicilian crown, through the deposition of Frederic II., the death of Conrad IV., the defeat of Manfred by Charles of Anjou and his death, and the defeat and execution of Conradin, that influenced the other states of the Papal system in a way that at last led to the dissolution of the system itself. This influence showed itself first of all in England.

In the latter part of the twelfth century, the royal house of England was esteemed the principal support of the Guelphs. Duke Henry the Lion, son-in-law of the Emperor Henry II., found there his support against Frederic Barbarossa. Richard Cœur-de-Lion made a most moving petition to Innocent III. in behalf of his nephew Otho, and promised in his name to maintain the rights of the Roman Church, and to observe the fealty that had been sworn to her (*debitam et juratam fidelitatem*). But when Otho IV. had succeeded to the royal and imperial crowns, and had proved false to his fealty, Frederic, his successor, withdrew the English support from the descendants of the Guelphs by marrying Isabel Plantagenet, the daughter of King John, and thus becoming brother-in-law of King Henry III., and of Richard Earl of Cornwall, afterwards German king. In his disputes with the Popes, Frederic endeavoured to gain the support of England, but could only win over the barons to his side. There was at this time marvellous discontent in England against Rome, because of the numerous Italians who obtained English benefices while the States of the Church were in the hands of Frederic. The English ambassadors at the Council of Lyons, in 1245, represented to Innocent IV. that Italians were receiving over 60,000 marks a year, a sum that exceeded the income of the king (*qui est tutor ecclesie, et regni gubernat-*

*cula moderatur*). Not receiving an answer to their mind, the ambassadors withdrew, with the threat that England would no longer pay the Roman tribute. But in spite of the barons, the English Bishops declared in favour of the tax, and put their seals to the deed whereby King John surrendered his crown to Innocent III. The parliament, however, in 1246, limited all further grants of English benefices to foreigners; and though Innocent's energetic measures prevented further resolutions to the same effect, he was unable to allay the national discontent against Rome, or to calm the tempest to which it gave rise.

In English history two antagonistic principles may always be found, not as Thierry thought, the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman elements, or the partizans of elective against hereditary monarchy, or the party that supported the claims of the house of Montfort, the collateral line of the Plantagenets through Eleanor, daughter of King John and wife of Simon of Leicester, in opposition to the party that supported the male and principal line. The dualism of English policy lay deeper than this, and consisted in the antagonistic principles of *common life*, peculiarly, almost exclusively expressed by the Church, and of *nationality*. Unless England was to be gradually brought to a state of complete isolation, which threatened to unchristianise her nationality, it was necessary for her to be bound with strong ties to the common centre of Christendom. It is said, that before King John became a vassal of Rome, he had been coquetting with the faith of the Koran; and the ferocious sensuality of his character disposes one to believe the report. We think that this nationality characterised the Anglo-Saxon period of English history.

A little later, Innocent IV. had to spend one-half of the Church revenues on the great contest which was called *negotium ecclesiasticæ libertatis*, and the other on the defence of the Holy Land, for which he had to depend on the English and French ever since Frederic II., king of Jerusalem, had allied himself with the Saracens against the Pope. The origin of the miserable state of Palestine may be traced to the hasty retreat of Richard I. with his Englishmen, who for the last fifty years of the Christian power in the East were the chief cause that Saladin's favourite idea of transplanting the war of invasion into Europe could not be carried into effect in the thirteenth century.

In the days of Henry II., the Popes had to watch that the feudalism of the Normans did not use the Constitutions of Clarendon to crush all liberty. In like manner, Alexander IV. had to write to Henry III. with an earnest admonition



to him to maintain the ecclesiastical rights, liberties, and immunities which were contained in the general charters that he had granted, and which had been sanctioned by the excommunication of all offenders. But whilst in Germany the lay opposition found its expression in the emperor, throughout the west of England it was concentrated in the nobility. The articles which the English Bishops declared themselves ready to prove in 1257, show how little the prosperity of England would have gained by a victory of the narrow-minded national party over the defenders of the common cause.\* Prince Henry, the son of Isabella, was at first, as Matthew Paris pretends to know, destined by his father Frederic II. to inherit the crown of Sicily; and some Apulians, Sicilians, and Calabrians had already rendered him homage. But the emperor on his deathbed declared in favour of keeping the whole monarchy undivided, and fixed the sum to be paid by the Emperor Conrad to Henry as his indemnity, unless he chose to give him the kingdom of Arles or of Jerusalem. But in 1255, after the premature death of Henry, Alexander IV. offered the Sicilian throne to Edmund, second son of Henry III. of England. Both Edmund and his elder brother Edward I. thus seemed destined to become vassals of the Holy See; and their father was delighted with the thought, that by gaining Sicily for the house of Plantagenet, the French kingdom would be surrounded, and ground, as it were, between two millstones.† Thus the annexation to the Papal system of states opened to England a splendid prospect, not only of recovering the continental possessions which had been lost to Philip Augustus, but also of confining France to the right bank of the Loire. If this had taken place, there would have been no Babylonish captivity of Avignon in the Church's annals. In 1257, Prince Edmund had already received the Papal investiture by the ring; his father had recognised him as king, and had shown him to the English barons in an Apulian dress. But whilst Henry III. was hesitating to advance the large sums required for the expedition to Naples, Manfred was strengthening himself in Lower Italy. Edmund preferred a crusade in the East to the doubtful chances of conquest in Sicily; and the Holy See, which was forced to find a vassal that could protect it, offered the crown that he slighted to the French Prince Charles of Anjou. Thus were all Henry's hopes for England

\* "Imprimis quod vacantibus ecclesiis cathedralibus seu conventualibus, conventus talliantur, terræ relinquuntur incultæ, vastantur nemora, parci, et vivaria, corrunt ædificia, diripiuntur bona, depauperantur villani et male tractantur, ita quod mendicare cogantur." Matth. Paris, p. 129, ed. Paris. 1644.

† Matth. Paris, p. 613.

dashed to the ground; and he had the further mortification of seeing the Count of Provence and new King of Sicily procure the apostolic crown of Hungary for his descendants, and threaten even the Byzantine empire. The hesitation of the English gave the French the preponderance in the west, south, and east of Europe. But both in England and in Arragon the union with the Papal system of states tended to increase considerably the national power and greatness.

The nature of this political system is further elucidated by the relations of the Holy See with Don Pedro I. of Arragon. Honorius III., the successor of Innocent III., demanded from Don Jayme I. a tribute for Barcelona, in 1218; it was paid, and Jayme and his companion in arms, Theobald King of Navarre, were taken under the particular protection of the Holy See. The great King of Arragon wished to be crowned at Rome in 1229, but was prevented by the breaking out of the dispute of Frederic II. with the Pope. When the last possessions of the Christians in the Holy Land were attacked by the Mamelukes, the conqueror of Valencia took the cross. His conquests had already freed the Spanish and Italian seas, and he prepared a great fleet to carry him and his army to Ptolemais. He had embarked, when a storm separated him from the rest of his fleet; and he was persuaded, it is said, by his beloved Berengaria, to relinquish the crusade. This left Charles of Anjou, the king of Sicily, who had already wrested Provence from the Catalonian princes, at full liberty to give the expedition the more convenient turn of an attack on Tunis; but it was unsuccessful, on account of the death of King Louis IX. of France in 1270.

We see, then, that the dependence of Arragon upon Rome did not hinder its greatest monarch from any important undertaking. Nor did it prevent the marriage of his successor, Don Pedro, with Constanza, daughter of Manfred, the great enemy of the Popes. This union was the cause of many political changes. Jayme—the hero, legislator, historian, and king, a combination rarely found in the mediæval princes—died, and his kingdom was divided. His younger son Jayme received the Balcaric Isles, together with Roussillon, Conflans, and Montpellier, but in 1279 he was obliged to swear an oath of allegiance to his elder brother Don Pedro, who had inherited his father's principal possessions in the east of Spain, as Catalonia, Arragon, and Valencia. For nearly a century past, the fate of Apulia and Sicily, the feudal kingdom of the Popes, had given rise to complications, which, after shaking Italy and the empire, were now about to draw France and Spain into their eddies.

## SIR WALTER SCOTT.

It is a somewhat remarkable fact, that since the appearance of the biography of Sir Walter Scott by his son-in-law in 1835, none of the leading Reviews, with one exception, have attempted either a comprehensive criticism of the work itself, or a thorough analysis of the character of its subject. The *Edinburgh*,—to which Scott was in various ways related for many years, first as a contributor, afterwards as a determined opponent,—though it ably criticised his works while living, has had no word, either of praise or blame, to bestow upon his character when dead. The *Quarterly* has observed a similar silence. *Blackwood*, though its pages abound with affectionate and admiring allusions to Scotland's greatest writer, has abstained from the task of estimating the several parts and total weight of his character. The *Westminster Review* alone published so early as 1838, before the publication of the concluding volume of the *Life*, a long and remarkable paper on Scott from the pen of Mr. Carlyle. This article has since been reprinted among the writer's miscellaneous works. Yet, striking and suggestive as it is, and graphic as are many of its touches, we are not sure that the reticence of other journals was not a wiser course than the hasty verdict of the *Westminster*. Mr. Carlyle has not disposed of Sir Walter Scott by that somewhat supercilious criticism; the cause is weighty, and will require a re-hearing—perhaps more than one. Scott is a man who will take a great deal of killing :

“ Merses profundo, pulchrior evenit.”

No one has given better and abler counsel than Mr. Carlyle as to the necessity of being quite sure that we *see* a great man before we attempt to *over-see* him, that we *apprehend* the genius which we profess to *comprehend*. Yet we cannot think that in the article in question he has entirely followed his own counsel; and we shall have to point out, before we conclude, more than one passage marked, as we think, either by misapprehension or unfairness.

Mr. Carlyle quarrels with the biographer for having given to the public a “ compilation ” rather than a “ composition.” “ To picture forth the life of Scott, so that a reader might say, ‘ There is the physiognomy and meaning of Scott’s appearance and transit on this earth; such was he by nature; so did the world act on him, so he on the world;—with such result and significance for himself and us,’ ”—this, ac-

cording to the critic, was looked for at Mr. Lockhart's hand, and this was balked. We are told that "seven biographical volumes are given where one had been better." Now, for our part, we profess that, having, we hope, a due horror of prolixity and tediousness, we should deeply regret it, and think the world would have cause for regret, had Mr. Lockhart acted on such advice as this. Instead of fulfilling the humbler task to which the instinct of pious reverence impelled him,—the collection, namely, and orderly arrangement of those copious memorials which were in his possession, so that Scott might, as far as possible, tell his own story,—he might undoubtedly have produced a clever volume *about* Scott,—in the style perhaps of Mr. Edwin Paxton Hood upon Wordsworth,—in which the skill of the artist would have been more conspicuous than the qualities of his subject. But in the preface to the last volume he modestly grounds his adoption of the former plan on the consideration, that the reader is so "really treated as a judge, who has the evidence led in his presence, instead of being presented merely with the statement of the counsel, which he might have both inclination and reason to receive with distrust. Let it be granted to me," he continues, "that Scott belonged to the class of first-rate men, and I may very safely ask, who would be sorry to possess a biography of any such man of a former time in full and honest detail? If his greatness was a delusion, I grant that these Memoirs are vastly too copious; but had I not been one of those who consider it as a real substantial greatness, I should have been very unwilling to spend time on any record of it whatever."

Nor did Mr. Carlyle himself wholly fail to see the force of such considerations. "Scott's biography," he says, "if uncomposed, lies printed and indestructible here in the elementary shape, and can at any time be composed, if necessary, by any one who has a call to that." Moreover, the biographer of Frederic has not adopted for his own guidance the advice which he tendered to the biographer of Scott. Granting, which we readily do, that the historical sketch of the rise of the Hohenzollern family and of the kingdom of Brandenburg forms, like the vestibule before the temple, a desirable and beautiful proem to the life of Frederic the Great, yet, when we come to the Life itself, what reader but must have contemplated with amazement the dextrous literary manipulation by which—*e.g.* in the chapter headed "Journey to the Reich"—a few trifling particulars which might have been told in ten lines are spread over twenty or thirty pages. Scott's letters, according to Mr. Carlyle, are

“not interesting generally,” and he evidently thinks that great curtailments and omissions might have been made among those—but a selection, after all—which were printed by Mr. Lockhart. Yet the Prussian hero, even while in his ’teens, cannot write a trumpery note to his sister, or to some confidant of his youthful scrapes, without its being religiously presented entire by Mr. Carlyle, and ushered in by an *apparatus criticus* of illustrative information, which throws such a flood of light upon the poor little scrap of correspondence, that the brilliancy of the encircling *nimbus* sometimes contrasts ludicrously enough with the insignificance of the object illuminated. The rule of compression, which it seems was good enough for Scott, is to be reversed into the rule of dilatation, not to say dilution, for Frederic. For the latter, the telescope; for the former, the telescope reversed!

For ourselves, we are of opinion that Mr. Lockhart executed his task admirably well. Had he attempted to “picture forth” the life of Scott according to his own conception of it, he would have produced, we believe, a faithful and a striking portrait, yet one in which it would have been impossible to place the same confidence as in that which these seven volumes, as it were involuntarily, conjure up before us. Conceive if Boswell had given us a Boswellian portraiture of Dr. Johnson, instead of recording his conversation and printing his letters! In that case posterity would certainly have known next to nothing as to the “physiognomy and meaning” of Johnson’s “appearance and transit on this earth;” nor would the world have ever seen that admirable article by Mr. Carlyle himself, in which he first recognised the true greatness of the hero, and did justice to the loyal loving heart of the biographer. Lockhart certainly would have made a much better “composition” than Boswell—there is no question of that; but how many features might not even he have overlooked or misread the expression of! A great genius may be compared to the pillar of fire of which Brama could never soar to the summit, nor Vishnu dive down to the base; it roots itself “deeper than e’er plummet sounded” in the innermost substance of nature and of fact, while it blooms and waves above in an ideal solitary world. To take the measure of the spiritual being is a far different task from portraying the outward features. Even this latter is a task which is seldom done thoroughly well; how much less probable is it that the painter of the mind shall place aright all its lights and shadows! We cordially agree with Mr. Carlyle that most biographies are too long; but the reason is, that with most men whose lives are written

in these times the materials, if used in their full extent, are soon felt to be redundant. Why? Because the subjects of most of these memoirs are not so interesting that we care to know all that we might know concerning them. Facilities exist for ascertaining every dame-school in Bristol and its vicinity which Southey frequented in his childhood, with full particulars as to the names, ages, tempers, acquirements, peculiarities, &c. of the worthy dames. Again, the reader of Wordsworth may find out by consulting his biography the precise circumstances under which nearly every one of his effusions was conceived and composed. But the answer is, that we do not *care* to know such matters; that life is not long enough; and that neither Southey nor Wordsworth are sufficiently heroic characters to induce us to convert our brains into reliquaries in order to treasure up the minutest shreds and parings of information about their personal history. We own that the Life of Wordsworth is a lengthy and heavy work, though only in two volumes; and that the six-volume Life of Southey will remain unreadable until it shall have been reduced five-sixths. But we say still,—find a man whose life is *worth* being told in detail, and that becomes the right way to tell it. Among the innumerable memoirs—unreadable or but half-readable—which burden the shelves of the circulating-libraries, impatiently waiting for Charon and a safe convoy to eternal forgetfulness, let us be properly thankful that here is at least one biography which contains the story, told in the main by himself, of a capacious, earnest, brave, clear-sighted, ready-witted human soul;—a biography which does not chronicle and catalogue the solitary schemes of the dreaming poet, nor detail the petty incidents that mark the tame existence of the professional *littérateur*, but which paints in manifold presentation and bright vivid colours a complete order or cosmos of human society, in which—ranging through every stage and status of it, from court to camp, from castle to hovel—the first and most honoured head was ever that of the author of *Waverley*;—a biography which, should *Old Mortality* and its compeers be ever forgotten, may still be conceived to survive by centuries the doom which blotted them out of remembrance, since they after all describe—not with entire truth—an imaginary world and fabled personages; but in this, the very actual life of the first thirty years of a memorable century, the life of its kings, nobles, soldiers, statesmen, poets, and *savants*, is compendiously illustrated, with a distinctness to which no other hundred contemporary volumes can make equal pretension.

Yet while expressing a general approval of the plan and management of Mr. Lockhart's work, and—*inter alia*—of the fullness with which Scott's epistolary vein is illustrated, we would not deny that the patience of the critic and the appetite of the admirer are occasionally overtaxed in this particular. The letters to "Jane," his daughter-in-law, need not have been published. Scott himself rightly describes them as "rambling stuff;" indeed, they are such as many a ready-writing kind-hearted man rattles off every day. The letters to his son Walter, though some of them are most admirable and characteristic, would bear abridgment, and also those to Mr. Terry on theatrical and other matters.

Perhaps one or two other slight blemishes might be mentioned; but as our present object is not to review Lockhart's biography, but to endeavour to form some correct estimate of the rank amongst men, intellectual and personal, to be assigned to its subject, we shall merely record our conviction here that this is the most valuable and interesting biography in our language next to *Boswell's Life of Johnson*. Let us now endeavour so to sketch the life of Scott that the total power and distinctive qualities of his genius may become apparent, and that certain lessons may be deduced which to all thinking and acting men, but more peculiarly to men of letters, the spectacle of his changeful fortunes, his incredible activity, his aims, virtues, and failings, is well calculated to convey.

A fragment of autobiography, extending to about sixty pages, gives us Sir Walter's own account of himself from his birth to his twenty-first year. It is high praise to say of it that, although inferior, it much reminds us of Goethe's *Aus meinem Leben*. With a like easy and graceful touch, the writer describes clearly, but without undue minuteness, the antecedents and status of his family, the circumstances of his boyhood, the line of his self-education, and his first launching into active life. Southey, in *his* autobiography prefixed to the *Life* by his son, was much more liberal of information. About a hundred and forty closely printed pages are devoted to the delineation of the great man's career *up to his fourteenth year!* After wading through it, we remember that our first feeling was, that we had never been so "bethumped with words" before. With the minute and elaborate dullness of a third-rate Dutch painter, the author details a crowd of petty incidents, and introduces us into half a dozen domestic interiors, drawn from the life, with every accessory of habit, dress, and furniture complete, which

under no conceivable circumstances could interest any mortal except himself and his own near relations.

The leading outlines of the life of Scott are to be found in biographies, cyclopædias, and editions innumerable, and we shall not waste much time in retracing them here. Born at Edinburgh in 1771, of a respectable family, belonging to that house or clan of Scott of which the Duke of Buccleuch is the feudal head, brought up mostly in the country at his grandfather's farm of Sandyknowe, not a dozen miles from the Tweed and Abbotsford, educated at the High School and College of his native city, apprenticed to his father as a lawyer's clerk, called to the bar at the age of twenty-one, happily married at twenty-six,—there is nothing in all this foreign to the lot of a thousand ordinary Scotchmen, similarly situated as to family and worldly advantages, who have lived, laboured, and died, in the course of the last seventy years. However, considering the character of the times when he was arriving at manhood, the absence of eccentricity and extravagance in a young man so greatly gifted, the steady sober application to common duties, are in fact a greater marvel than the opposite demeanour would have been. While Coleridge and Southey were arranging the details of a Pantisocratic community on the banks of the Susquehanna, and Wordsworth was fraternising at Orleans with republican generals, Walter Scott, having no faith in the current nostrums, nor conceiving that he was born to set right the disjointed time, was minding his own business instead of mankind's, and ever more firmly rooting himself in the present and past life of his own nation. He was no "rolling stone;" rather, he was the very opposite of the character which the proverb implies; and hence, from first to last, his whole being went on accumulating and aggregating to itself, like a snow-ball, fresh layers of association and new stores of kindred thought, without being compelled by any violent change of place or circumstances to submit to the abrasion of any portion of these moral incrustations. Passionately fond of open-air sports, and enabled through his great strength and courage to excel in them, in spite of his lameness, he was not only thus placed in sympathy with a large class of vigorous and robust persons for whom the common type of the pale sedentary writer was an object of pity or indifference, but gained thereby, to be made use of afterwards, an insight into a province of antiquity which cannot otherwise be fully understood,—the *play-life* of our forefathers. Holding fast to the skirts of the law, and taking the good of his profession with the evil, the drawbacks with the further-



ances, he kept always a recognised rank in society, became *au fait* with the traditions and freemasonry of an important profession; and in this direction also was enabled to observe and to sympathise with many worthy and remarkable persons, who would never have unbent, nor disclosed their inmost selves, except at the talismanic *shibboleth* pronounced by a brother of the gown. A Jacobite in feeling, a Tory in practice, he preferred the ties of kindred and party to the alluring theories of political and social perfectibility which were then prevalent. With eager zeal he flung himself into every patriotic scheme of national defence to which the exigencies of the time gave rise; he became quarter-master of a regiment of volunteer cavalry, and was familiarised with military exercises, and in some sense with the life of camps: hence, again, the twofold advantage; community of aim and employment brought him into close relations with the aristocratic and governing classes, to whose hands the military preparations were mainly committed; and when he came to write of war and statecraft, it was with more than the mere second-hand knowledge of a civilian that he handled the pen. Sandyknowe, Kelso, Ashestiel, Abbotsford, and Dryburgh all lie within the circuit of a few miles; Edinburgh and Lasswade are within forty miles of Abbotsford; yet when we have gone over these names, we have mentioned every home that he ever had between birth and the grave. The fruits of a tree so deeply rooted may well be “racy of the soil;” the marriage of the poetic imagination to a life so real, so masculine, so practical, may well have resulted in creations fitted to captivate either sex and every age, to charm the pensive student and the experienced man of action, to exhibit the ideal, without loss of beauty, under the forms of the real.

Scott, we have said, was happily married at the age of twenty-six, and the union endured through nine-and-twenty happy years; but the power of love had taken earlier possession of that strong heart, and left there indelible traces. In the matter of love, the nature of many men is like sand—impressions are quickly made and as quickly effaced; his was like Egyptian granite—once deeply engraved, it bore the mark for ever. There was a lady, the daughter of a Northern baronet, to whom Scott became attached at the age of eighteen. There was an engagement, or *quasi-engagement*, between them, which subsisted for several years; but she broke it off at last, and married another. There are some touching allusions to her in the Diary. Thus, in the entry for December 18th, 1825:

"What a life mine has been!—half-educated, almost wholly neglected or left to myself; stuffing my head with most nonsensical trash, and undervalued by most of my companions for a time; getting forward, and held a bold and clever fellow, contrary to the opinion of all who thought me a mere dreamer; broken-hearted for two years; my heart handsomely pieced again; *but the crack will remain till my dying day.*"

Again, speaking of a visit to St. Andrew's in 1827:

"I sat down on a grave-stone, and recollected the first visit I made to St. Andrew's, now thirty-four years ago. . . . I remembered the name I then carved in Runic characters on the turf beside the castle-gate, and I asked why it should still agitate my heart. But my friends came down from the tower, and the foolish idea was chased away."

Imagination and wonder, acting on the strong tendency of his nature to the real, determined from the first the nature of his self-education, and the bent of his literary endeavours. Living intensely in the present, and yet a native of an old historic land, and allied to ancient families, he was prompted by patriotism and family pride, and enabled by his strong power of imagining, to realise the life of the past also; and he found in a memory of preternatural tenacity the aids and materials which he required. Works of pure imagination delighted him first: "Spenser," he says, referring to his tenth or eleventh year, "I could have read for ever." Tasso, Ariosto, and all the romances he could come at, were read about the same time. But the love of the real grew upon him; he took to Percy's *Reliques*, which he first read "under a plane-tree in a garden sloping down to the Tweed at Kelso." In those noble old ballads, the characters, places, and circumstances are many of them real; and the scenes of some of the stories are laid in the very border-country which he knew and loved so well. "From this time," he says in the Autobiography, "the love of natural beauty, more especially when combined with ancient ruins or remains of our fathers' piety or splendour, became with me an insatiable passion, which, if circumstances had permitted, I would willingly have gratified by travelling over half the globe." In his first essays at authorship,—his version of *Lenore* and other German ballads,—he put forth but little of his strength; and they naturally failed to attract much notice. Perfect finish of expression was never his *forte*; and what force and fervour of thought these poems might have would naturally be attributed to the German originals. The version of *Götz von Berlichingen*, published in 1799, succeeded ill, for this among other reasons. It may be remarked *en passant*, that

Mr. Carlyle's theory that Götz was the parent of the romantic literature of which Scott was the chief representative, and Werther the spiritual fountain whence flowed the Byronic school and the "literature of despair," seems, if examined, to be more ingenious than true. Scott, at least, was influenced in his literary development neither by the dramatic form of Götz,—a form which he never once seriously employed,—nor by its subject and pervading spirit, since nature and circumstance had already settled his literary bent years before Götz had met his eyes. Undiscouraged by failure, he began now to trust more to his own genius, and to imitate, or rather *parallel*, those old ballads which he was all this time indefatigably collecting. Thus were produced the poems which he contributed to Lewis's *Tales of Wonder* in 1801, and the two volumes of the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, which came out in 1802. The stirring poem of "Count Albert," and some of the original pieces in the *Minstrelsy*, could not fail to attract attention. But still an achievement so novel, so well-sustained, and so variously beautiful, as the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, took the world completely by surprise. Originating in a request made by the "fair Buccleuch" to the bard of the clan,—which, coming from her, amounted to a command,—the *Lay* was the first adequate illustration of the powers of the rarely-gifted man whom Scotland had nurtured for mankind. A most potent imagination was required to conceive so vividly, a rare intellectual energy to portray so forcibly, the ancient life and manners of the border; only a brave and generous spirit could so tell of war; only a being overflowing with activity, and replete with knowledge of every kind, could write a poem which, whatever its defects, is nowhere tedious, but full of rapid movement from beginning to end. If any one wishes to understand the full force of this praise, let him read and compare with the *Lay* Wordsworth's *White Doe of Rylstone*. This poem was written in 1807, only two years after the appearance of the *Lay*; and the metre, the subdivision into cantos, the kind of subject, even the date of the action, seem all to be borrowed from the earlier poem. The language is purer, the versification, perhaps, smoother; really beautiful passages are not wanting; the morality is unexceptionable, and the moralising incessant. And yet, and yet, the *White Doe* is *heavy* reading; we do not read it through at a sitting, and wish there were more, as we did when the *Lay* first fell into our hands. Is not the reason of this, that the *Lay* is a genuine piece of the life of man? that it is not so much Scott who describes that rough ancestral world, but that that world, through his

agency, unfolds itself in a solid-seeming vision before the reader's eye; that it is a piece of objective, not subjective, writing? On the other hand, in the *White Doe* the musing, designing, moralising individuality, William Wordsworth, is never for a moment hidden from your sight.

The popularity of the *Lay* naturally induced Scott to go on working in the same mine; *Marmion* came out in 1808, and the *Lady of the Lake* in 1810. Of Lord Jeffrey's criticisms on these poems, since published among his Essays, the first excited by its severity the ire of Scott and his admirers, and was thought by them to be not untinged with a hostile political animus. Yet if any one were to take up these essays at the present day, he would probably consider them both substantially just. *Marmion* is an exceedingly faulty poem; and there is a certain pretentiousness about it which makes its faults the more offensive. The introductions to the cantos, addressed to six of his friends, are so long, and touch upon such a variety of topics, that the impressions they create jar violently with those which the story itself is designed to produce. Some of them are as very doggerel as ever was written—the “very false gallop of verses;” there is but one, that to William Rose, containing the famous lines on Pitt and Fox, which seems to have been written with care, and possesses any permanent interest. Again, the favourable criticism on the *Lady of the Lake* is equally sustainable. In this poem Scott's poetical style reaches its acme; here the romantic tale culminates; the utmost that can be expected from a kind of poetry far below the highest, and from a metre essentially inferior to the heroic, is here attained. The story is conducted with much art; the characters are interesting; the scenery glorious; the versification far less faulty than in *Marmion*. Succeeding efforts—*Rokeby*, *The Lord of the Isles*, *Don Roderick*, *Harold*—did but witness a progressive declension. With the last, published in 1817, Scott grew utterly disgusted before he had finished it, and worked off the concluding portion in an agony of angry haste. “I left off writing poetry,” he said, in 1832, “because Byron bet me.” In truth, the spicy subjective element which Byron introduced into his *Corsair* and *Childe Harold* made Scott's romantic tales, if written in any thing short of his very best manner, seem superficial and twaddling. But then Scott, as he goes on to say, was too proud, too manly, to strip, like Byron, for the public amusement, after the fashion of his own gladiator.

Upon the whole, we regard much of Scott's poetry as likely to live for the same reason that Horace's or Boileau's

satires command an undying fame; not because it is poetry of the best kind, but because in its kind it is the best. The best specimens of it are pervaded with that healthy elastic freshness, and surround us with that pure bracing moral atmosphere, without which romances will not *keep*; such as are seasoned with morbid feeling or sentimentality, much more, impurity, leave a pleasant flavour behind them for the moment; but time develops their inherent rottenness, and they become, sooner or later, offensive to the moral sense. The *Lady of the Lake* will probably outlive the *Corsair*, because it appeals to wider and more permanent sympathies. The young, the vehement, the restless, delight in the one, because it reflects and glorifies to their imagination the wild disorder of their own spirits; the aged and the calm find little in it to prize or to commend. But the former poem, besides that "hurried frankness of composition which pleases soldiers, sailors, and young people of bold and active disposition,"\* has attractions also for the firm even mind of manhood and the pensiveness of age: the reality and vividness of its painting, whether of manners or of nature, delight the one; the healthy buoyancy of tone, recalling the days of his youthful vigour, pleasantly interests the other.

But we have got beyond the point to which we brought down his personal history. In 1799, two years after his marriage, Scott was appointed Sheriff of Selkirkshire, with a salary of 300*l*. The duties of a stipendiary county magistrate, which were thus imposed upon him, he discharged zealously and efficiently for the remainder of his life. Compelled to transfer his residence to the county where his duties lay, he settled at Ashestiel, a manor-house on the Tweed belonging to Colonel Russell, in 1804. Parts of the scenery surrounding the house are finely described in the introduction to the first canto of *Marmion*:

"Late, gazing down the steepy linn  
That hems our little garden in,  
Low in its dark and narrow glen  
You scarce the rivulet might ken,  
So thick the tangled green-wood grew,  
So feeble trilled the streamlet through:  
Now, murmuring hoarse, and frequent seen  
Through bush and brier, no longer green,  
An angry brook it sweeps the glade,  
Brawls over rock and wild cascade,  
And, foaming brown with doubled speed,  
Hurries its waters to the Tweed."

Ever since he had begun to pay serious attention to

\* Scott's *Diary, Life*, vi. 321.

literature, Scott had made slow progress at the bar ; and the duties of the shrievalty interposed a fresh obstacle to his professional success. Determining, therefore, to abandon the law as a career, he cast about to obtain one of those comfortable berths which, in the days of unreformed parliaments, were considerably provided for briefless barristers who could command good interest. He obtained, through the Duke of Buccleuch and Lord Melville, in 1806, the reversion of a clerkship in the Edinburgh court of session, with a salary of 1300*l.* a year. He performed the duties from this date, but did not draw the salary till 1812. These duties, it should be said, were far from being nominal, since they compelled him to close attendance in court on five days in the week during seven or eight months of the year.

He remained at Ashiestiel for eight years, until the approaching return of its owner from India, with the intention of making it his residence, obliged him to make a change. A few miles lower down the Tweed, on the right or eastern bank, lay an estate of about a hundred acres of heathy hill and marshy lowland, uninviting enough in appearance, which was then in the market. Scott, who believed himself to be rich, or fast becoming so, bought Clarty Hole, as this property was named, in 1811 ; and, having made some trifling alterations in the cottage which stood upon it, performed his flitting in May 1812. The mania for acres—the desire *arrondir sa terre*—soon seized upon him ; and, after 1814, when the Waverley series began to appear, and their unheard-of popularity brought him in large sums, he began to buy up, often at extravagant prices, any patch of neighbouring ground which the owner desired or could be induced to sell. Abbotsford—for so the place had been immediately renamed from the ford across the Tweed hard by, belonging formerly to Melrose Abbey—thus grew by the aggregation of particles until, in 1818, it made a very pretty property of near one thousand acres. Meantime the original cottage had been altered, added to, eclipsed, and at last fairly crowded out of existence by the Gothic castle which gradually arose on the banks of the Tweed, and attained its completion in 1821. The hilly part of the property was planted with great care and judgment, and now forms a striking and beautiful feature in the scenery of a country generally bare of trees.

The period between 1814 and 1826, which witnessed the publication of the first twenty-two of the novels, was one of great prosperity, of labour unremitting, and of reputation ever widening. *Waverley* appeared in July 1814. Nothing

can be more pleasant than to read of the casual way in which the thing came to pass,—the Ms. of the first volume, which had been written years before, having been accidentally stumbled upon in rummaging an old cabinet, glanced over, approved, and completed in three weeks;—of the indefatigable hand and pen, seen through the window of the house in Castle Street during those three weeks, which “bothered” William Menzies by their preternatural activity;—or of the healthy alacrity with which Scott, as soon as the work was finished, started off on a voyage to the Shetlands; on returning from which, two months later, he found all the world talking of *Waverley*. For all such details—and most interesting many of them are—connected with the composition and publication of the novels, we must refer to the “Life” itself. We can only notice some few occurrences during this period which happen to illustrate in any special way the temper and character of the man.

In 1817 and the two following years, Scott was attacked at intervals by an excruciatingly painful malady,—spasms in the stomach. Even a man of his robust frame could not task his brain with impunity as he had done. *Guy Mannering* written in six weeks,—the last two volumes of *Waverley* in less,—and the mind of man so perilously and inextricably knit up with every fibre of his bodily structure, as we know it to be! The first attack came on during a dinner-party at his own house in Castle Street, when he was obliged to leave the room with a scream of pain which terrified his guests. His hair turned white during one of these severe fits of pain, which only yielded to the severest medical treatment,—copious blood-letting, blistering, and opiates. Yet such was his self-mastery, so great the ascendancy in him of the spiritual principle over the weakness of flesh and blood, that some of his most carefully-planned and highly-wrought works—*Rob Roy*, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and *The Bride of Lammermoor*—were written during this period of pain.

The year 1819, which was marked to Scott by severe family afflictions, brought with it also anxieties of another kind. Distress was rife among the weavers of Glasgow and Paisley, and in the mining districts of the north of England, and constant but secret communication was carried on between the leaders of the disaffected operatives in both countries. It is curious to note the different spirit in which the Tory poets of the day met this alarming crisis. Scott—in his threefold character of aristocrat, country gentleman, and county magistrate—instantly forms a plan for “rising in arms” to put down these wretched half-starved weavers, and

organises, with all the enthusiasm of a poet, and all the cautious shrewdness of a Scotch laird, a volunteer corps of loyal borderers, whom he and his neighbours—Scott of Gala and Pringle of Torwoodlee—are ready to lead in person against all disturbers of the peace of the marches. Southey, who has no property and no official status, whose class-feelings would naturally have led him to sympathise with the grievances of the malcontents, since he was himself of humble origin, fires at them whole broadsides of patriotic declamation from the pages of the *Quarterly*, and repels the cry for reform with a lofty air of injured innocence and oppressed virtue which it is amusing to contemplate. Wordsworth was busily employed during this terrible year in carrying through the press *Peter Bell, the Waggoner*, the sonnets on the River Duddon, &c. There is nothing either in his biography or in his poems to indicate that, during a crisis big with the fate of England, his social sympathies extended beyond the peaceful valleys of Westmoreland.

It does not seem to occur to any one of the three Tory bards to inquire whether these terrible Radicals might not have some real wrongs to be redressed, some sound and wise reforms to advocate. But in Sir Walter opposition at least assumes an intelligible and manly form. He belongs to a class whose privileges are threatened by the menacing attitude of the classes below it; and the natural instinct of self-defence—quite independently of the strong Conservative cast of his mind, which attached him to all that was traditionary and prescriptive—would have led him to resist the claims of the Radicals. Such Toryism must be, if not respected, allowed for; for it is in the nature of things. And speaking generally, all political action which is connected with real social interests and springs naturally from a given social status, is, if not always commendable, at least legitimate; the actor is, as our neighbours say, *dans son droit*. The political success of England is a consequence, not of the indifference of her citizens about their class-interests, but of that sense and self-control which induces men who are indissolubly wedded to those interests, and earnestly bent on promoting them, to make compromises with each other in order to maintain the stability of the *common weal*. On the other hand, the political activity of a mere theorist is generally suspicious and always nugatory. Not that the philosophy of politics, or even the pros and cons of any special measure, may not be properly and exhaustively handled by a political thinker, quite apart from any personal or class interest, provided he write *as a thinker*, not as a partisan. But it is



surely an abuse of literary gifts to employ for party-purposes that facility and impressiveness of style which nature intended to be "as general" in its benefits "as the casing air;" having no interest in the disputed question yourself, to thwart to the utmost of your power those who have, and instead of arguing on the merits of the proposed reform, to pour forth volleys of fluent invective on the reformers. Yet it was in great measure by such unworthy employment that Southey gained his livelihood. He wrote against Parliamentary Reform and Catholic Emancipation, not as a political essayist, not as an aristocrat, not as an Orangeman, but as a professional declaimer or rhetorician. It was, therefore, not surprising that William Smith quoted against him in the House of Commons the frantic Jacobinism of his own *Wat Tyler*, or that Byron wrote with grinding scorn of the piously-profane rhapsodies of the *Vision of Judgment*.

Assuredly Scott's Toryism was infinitely more respectable than Southey's; and yet it too had its selfish and unpleasing side, which was well exposed in an article which appeared at the time in the *Edinburgh Review*. The writer said, evidently alluding to the warlike preparations of Scott and others,

"If, without any indication of a desire to conciliate, the complaints of the people are repressed with insults and menaces; . . . if the whole mass of their complaints, reasonable and unreasonable, are to be treated as seditious and audacious, and to meet with no other answer than preparations to put them down by force,—then indeed we may soon enough have a civil war among us, and a war of a character far more deplorable and atrocious than was ever known in this land,—a war of the rich against the poor," &c.

Allowing, however, for that illiberality which strong class-feelings engender, even in the noblest minds, Scott, as a citizen, remains an object of true admiration. In his relations to the poor he was kind and wise, understanding thoroughly their class-feelings, always ready to help in case of need, but jealously guarding and cherishing in them the sense and the desire of a manly independence. When any emergency occurred demanding new adaptations, such as a year of high prices, or a dearth of employment among the Galashiels weavers, he struck out at once, with ready sagacity, the true way of meeting the difficulty. When employment by piece-work seemed advisable, he resorted to it, however contrary to country usage; where daily wages were preferable, he employed that method. All the suggestions and reasonings that his letters contain on the condition of the poor, or on the poor-

laws, are always clear, practical, and sagacious. In truth, Scott's powerful and many-sided capacity for action cannot well be overrated. Of no man could the saying of Sydney Smith be predicated with so near an approach to truth, that he would be "ready at an hour's notice to write the play of *Hamlet* or take the command of the Channel fleet." He was certainly a most efficient county magistrate; and when the higher organising and ruling powers were called for, he was never found at fault. The occasion, indeed, was pitiful enough; but the man who arranged the whole ceremonial for the reception of George IV. on his state visit to Edinburgh in 1822, surmounted equal difficulties with the statesman who administers the affairs of a great free nation. For the same mixture of gentleness and firmness which reconciled the miserable claims for precedence of Highland chieftains and their "tails,"—the same quick perception of character which assigned to each performer his proper place and function in the show,—the same union and concentration of varied powers which made out of the whole affair a signally successful pageant,—would have been correspondingly effective in *altiori materiâ*. Few modern men have shown themselves more successful governors and organisers than Sir George Grey, now Governor of the Cape Colony. Yet we speak from some personal knowledge when we say, that the talents which have caused his success, while they remarkably resemble, certainly do not surpass, those which Sir Walter had clearly the power of applying at will to the management of affairs.

Yet, with all this keenness of observation and perfection of the practical faculties, Scott, with his eyes wilfully blinded, walked over the precipice of ruin! "It was a favourite saw of his own," says Mr. Lockhart (iv. 175), "that the wisest of our race often reserve the average stock of folly to be all expended upon some one flagrant absurdity." Such an absurdity was the commercial connection which he formed in 1805, and maintained till 1826, with the brothers Ballantyne. Yet this, the most prosaic and commonplace part of his life, is strangely linked with the illusions which were the daily bread of his imagination. Upon this coarse thread, running through the gay silken texture of his poet-life, depended the stability of his fortunes, and with these was bound up the success of his peculiar ambition. Ambition must always have some "illness that attends it," and Scott's has been handled without mercy by Mr. Carlyle. What can be urged in his excuse has been beautifully and forcibly said in a passage at the conclusion of Mr. Lockhart's work, part of which we shall

presently quote. But the main external facts of the business must first be briefly narrated.

In the year 1805, soon after the publication of the *Lay*, Scott having recently sold the estate of Rosebank on the Tweed, left him by his uncle Captain Robert Scott, for the sum of 5000*l.*, invested the money in the printing and book-selling concern of James and John Ballantyne, who had both been his schoolfellows at Kelso. His motive, it seems, was the desire of enlarging his income to an extent beyond what literature as yet promised, or his slackening assiduity at the bar permitted him to hope for. In answer to Lockhart, immediately after the crash in 1826, he wrote :

"It is easy, no doubt, for any friend to blame me for entering into connection with commercial matters at all. But I wish to know what I could have done better ; excluded from the bar, and then from all profits for six years by my colleague's prolonged life. Literature was not in those days what poor Constable has made it ; and with my little capital I was too glad to make commercially the means of supporting my family. I got but 600*l.* for the *Lay*," &c.

This commercial connection with the Ballantynes was always kept a strict secret. For a time affairs went well, and large sums of money were placed at Scott's disposal. But James had not had the education of a printer ; and being naturally indolent, and increasingly employed and confided in by Scott as the reader and critic of his works before publication, he failed to bestow that close personal attention to the business details of the printing-house without which no such speculation can succeed. John, the "picaroon," was a dashing little *roué*,—an excellent mimic, a first-rate singer, a gay, light, reckless adventurer. His utter incompetency to manage a publishing business is evident from this description ; but Lockhart burdens him with a more serious charge than incapacity. It seems that by the system of acceptances and renewals which he introduced, and by cunningly hiding from Scott the real state of the firm's affairs, particularly the extent to which it had become indebted to Constable in the crisis of 1813, he prevented him from making so searching an inquiry into his real position as would have infallibly resulted in the winding-up of the partnership. His motives for this conduct are placed in a clear light by Mr. Lockhart ; but it falls not within the compass of our design to linger over them. His devotion to Scott will mitigate in some minds the severity of their judgment on his delinquencies. "The chief enjoyment and glory of my life," he says, in a private memorandum which came to light after his death, "was the possession of the friendship and confidence of the greatest of men." Lastly, the "Great

Unknown" partner, Scott himself, was too sanguine and *complaisant* a man to conduct a business on those strict mercantile principles which alone can make it *pay*. He always over-rated the works of others, particularly of his personal friends; and there were several such works which he recommended for publication at the risk of the firm, which turned out ruinously bad speculations. Again, as, through John Ballantyne's management, he never knew the exact position in which he stood, nor the real amount of his liabilities, he launched out into purchases of land and lavish expenditure on building and furniture, which his real resources, even had the firm been economically managed, would probably have been inadequate to meet.

The partnership narrowly escaped a dissolution so early as 1813. In the spring and summer of that year, Scott was continually harassed by letters from John Ballantyne containing urgent applications for advances. The correspondence may be summed up on Scott's side by the pithy postscript to one of his letters: "For God's sake, treat me as a man, and not as a milch-cow." This crisis was terminated by Scott's obtaining the security of his chieftain the Duke of Buccleuch to a cash-credit for 4000*l*. In 1814 commenced the publication of the novels; and elated by their extraordinary sale, the partners one and all seemed to have cheated themselves into the belief that all was right, and that their financial position was thenceforth secure. John Ballantyne died in 1821, in utter ignorance of the real state of his affairs, imagining himself to have 2000*l*. to leave, whereas he was in fact deeply in debt. Scott went on enlarging his domains, and raising up new buildings. But the bubble was sure to break at last, and it only remains to tell the precise time and manner of the rupture.

Various premonitory indications had prepared Scott in some degree for the fatal 17th January 1826. Towards the end of the previous year he became aware that the house of Hurst and Robinson in London, the affairs of which he knew to be much mixed up with Constable's, and those with Ballantyne's, was labouring under severe financial pressure. On one particular day, the 18th December 1825, his Diary shows him to have been thoroughly alarmed; and his imagination immediately painted to him all the exposure, the publicity, the finger pointed at the humbled pride of the mushroom baronet, the compassion still more unendurable, the ruin of all that he had striven for during life, and the clouded future of his beloved children. But again there was a temporary gleam, and he hoped that he might win through the storm. Con-

stable went up to London, infuriated and almost beside himself at the near approach of his ruin; had interviews with Lockhart; pressed him to use Scott's name in negotiating with London bankers, which Lockhart peremptorily refused to do; and then astounded him by the revelation of the personal interest which Scott, as the Ballantynes' partner, had in bolstering up the credit of his house. Lockhart's first feeling was evidently one of deep mortification. A proud man himself, and of ancient lineage, he was quite unprepared for the announcement that his father-in-law had dabbled in "business," and was a partner in a printing concern. A more justifiable ground for annoyance might be the feeling that Scott had not treated him with perfect openness, and that the equivocations and dubious transactions in which the maintenance of the secret had involved him, cast a certain dimness over the bright escutcheon of his hero. Constable returned *re infectâ* to Edinburgh; in the middle of January, Hurst and Robinson dishonoured a bill drawn on them by Constable, and on the 17th of the month James Ballantyne called upon Scott and informed him of the necessity of suspension. All the world knows how Scott met the announcement, and faced the grim fact of ruin. The pages of that wonderful Diary, which he had fortunately begun to keep a few months before, show, in brief and indirect but unmistakable allusions, at what cost of inward agony he bore a calm front to the world. His liabilities were finally ascertained to amount to about 117,000*l.* This sum he had reduced by incessant labour to about 54,000*l.* at the time of his death.

In this connection with the Ballantynes, there are two circumstances to which we must devote a few words. First, how did the firm, considering the great success of the novels, fail for so enormous an amount? One can understand that Scott should have miscalculated his position by thousands, but how by scores of thousands? This question, as a whole, must for ever remain a mystery. Who can see his way through that financial imbroglio? Even Lockhart, with all his peculiar facilities for understanding the matter in all its parts, seems to be baffled by the complications of the problem. One intimation there is, however, which partly accounts for the magnitude of the liabilities, though at the expense of Constable's integrity. It seems that when it was not convenient for either Constable's or Ballantyne's house to take up their acceptances at the date of maturity, sets of counter-bills were drawn, which were accepted by the *other* firm, by means of the substitution of which in the market the original bills might be taken up. Now this practice was often resorted to

in apprehension of a difficulty which, when it came to the point, was got over. In this latter case the counter-bills, which evidently represented no "value received" to the acceptors, should of course have been cancelled. But it seems that a large number of such acceptances given by Ballantyne and Co. had, by the culpable carelessness and indolence of the brothers, been allowed to accumulate in Constable's desk. When the storm was darkening round him, Constable, it seems, half frantic at the prospect of his ruin, took these bills and threw them upon the market. Of the precise extent to which the liabilities of Ballantyne and Co. were thus increased, we are not informed; but it is obvious that the financial pressure upon them might easily in this way have been suddenly and indefinitely augmented.

The other circumstance to which we referred is the disingenuousness into which Scott was led by the secrecy in which he chose to involve the whole transaction. Vanity, it would seem, was the original motive to this secrecy; his professional comrades would have looked coldly and scornfully on the fact of his being engaged in *business*. And strong and fearless though he was in the ordinary emergencies of life, Scott could not brave *opinion*; there he was vulnerable and weak. Here, of course, he was wrong at the outset; if the commercial enterprise were unworthy of him, he should not have engaged in it; if unobjectionable, he should not have been ashamed of it. The frequent recommendations of the printing-house which his early letters contain leave a disagreeable impression. The high-minded and polished Ellis, so true a friend and admirer, did not deserve to have an *interested* recommendation conveyed to him of the *Edinburgh Annual Register*; an undertaking originated by the firm early in 1809, which turned out in every sense a disastrous failure.

But what was it that lay at the root of the whole matter? Whence the haste to be rich which made him not content with the very respectable income which the shrievalty, his wife's fortune, and his fast brightening literary prospects secured to him? Why, above all, did he not break off the connection in 1812, when he came into the enjoyment of 1300*l.* a year, the salary of his clerkship in the Court of Session? To answer the last question first,—Scott was by that time habituated to the connection; James Ballantyne was exceedingly useful to him in the ways already mentioned; and both brothers, according to Lockhart, knew how to practise an adroit and peculiar kind of flattery, which found a weak corner even in that robust and elevated mind. But the answer to the former question is not so easily given; it in-

volves, in fact, the further inquiry, For what did Scott truly live? whitherward did those marvellous powers aspire? Mr. Carlyle simply replies, For nothing, and no-whither. "One knows not," he says, "what idea worthy of the name of great, what purpose, instinct, or tendency that could be called great, Scott ever was inspired with. His life was worldly; his ambitions were worldly. There is nothing spiritual about him; all is economical, material, of the earth earthy." And further on: "There is small vestige of any such fire" (that of a living and guiding Idea) "being extant in the inner man of Scott."

Mr. Lockhart, in the concluding chapter of his work, though he disclaims the endeavour to present a complete analysis, examines minutely those features of Scott's character of which Mr. Carlyle's is the above reading. We must find room for one extract:

"An imagination such as his . . . soon shaped out a world of its own, to which it would fain accommodate the real one. The love of his country became, indeed, a passion; no knight ever tilted for his mistress more willingly than he would have bled and died to preserve even the airiest surviving nothing of her antique pretensions for Scotland. But the Scotland of his affections had the clan Scott for her kernel. Next and almost equal to the throne was Buccleuch. Fancy rebuilt and most prodigally embellished the whole system of the social existence of the middle ages, in which the clansman (wherever there were clans) acknowledged practically no sovereign but his chief. The author of the *Lay* would rather have seen his heir carry the banner of Bellenden gallantly at a football match on Carterhaugh, than he would have heard that the boy had attained the highest honours of the first university in Europe. His original pride was to be an acknowledged member of one of the "honourable families" whose progenitors had been celebrated by Satchels for following this banner in blind obedience to the patriarchal leader; his first and last worldly ambition was to be himself the founder of a distinct branch; he desired to plant a lasting root, and dreamt not of personal fame, but of long distant generations rejoicing in the name of Scott of Abbotsford. By this idea all his reveries, all his aspirations, all his plans and efforts, were overshadowed and controlled. The great object and end only rose into clearer daylight, and swelled into more substantial dimensions, as public applause strengthened his confidence in his own powers and faculties; and when he had reached the summit of universal and unrivalled honour, he clung to his first love with the faith of a paladin. It is easy enough to smile at all this; many will not understand it, and some who do may pity it. But it was at least a different thing from the modern vulgar ambition of amassing a fortune and investing it in land. The lordliest vision of acres would have had little

charm for him unless they were situated in Ettrick or Yarrow, or in

‘ Pleasant Tiviedale,  
Fast by the river Tweed.’ ”

This is a singular sort of ambition certainly; yet not altogether of that “earthly” “material” kind which Mr. Carlyle defines it to be. It flowed from a deep central idea, which was the light and the strength of Scott’s being,—the fire that burned within him, to use Mr. Carlyle’s own metaphor, and had power to burn up much of noisy vapouring pretension, and to harden with purifying flames many an element of good which of itself might not have withstood those days of trial. It was essentially an idea of conservation, not of revolution; it had not the gloss of novelty, nor the charm of audacity; its fruits were less manifest for the time, because it tended to maintain society erect, while the revolutionary idea tended to overturn it; yet it was not the less the master-thought of the whole life of him whom it possessed. Human society—such as in the revolutions of ages it had been able to fashion itself under the complex operation of religion, law, and special circumstance—had in its aspect for Scott something venerable, something even divine: it was his Palladium, his ark of the covenant; and whatever symbolised its majesty and stability was precious in his eyes. It is told of him, that when he was a young law-student, a party of Irish having combined together to prevent the performance of “God save the King” at the Edinburgh theatre, he headed a party against the democrats, which insisted on the performance of the loyal air; and on their resisting, engaged in a battle-royal with them, drubbed them soundly, and drove them out of the theatre. The Irishmen were doubtless animated by the idea of democracy, which Mr. Carlyle honours as the early and pure inspiration of Napoleon; but was the queller of the Irishmen possessed by no idea? Yes, truly; and perhaps it might have formulated itself somewhat in this wise: “These hot-brained Irishmen, who despise that traditionary deposit of right and freedom whose value they are incapable of perceiving, and would pull down in haste that which wiser and better men built up with infinite toil—why should I be daunted or duped by their parrot-cry of liberty and equality, to despise civil rights which my forefathers, from generation to generation, slowly won for me; and to join in a general assault upon other rights which the classes above me still retain, and, for aught I know, deserve. Not by theorising and fine writing, but by doing and suffering, was this Scotland of ours formed and built up out of the long barbaric



night, until knit together into this goodly fellowship of self-relying, law-obeying men. That place in the organism which I hold, and am proud to hold, I mean to keep; and therefore I will respect and defend the places of others, whether above or below me; for the value, the very significance, of each place is relative, and depends upon the preservation of the entire fabric in dignity and security." So Burke finely said, "To be attached to the subdivision, to love the little platoon we belong to in society, is the first principle, the germ, as it were, of all public affections. It is the first link in the series by which we proceed towards a love of our country and of mankind."

If England is still "a land that Freedom chose;" if in her national life there is no discontinuity, but the past and present mingle with and temper one another in an inextricable network of links and fibres; if we would rather have our *old* England than belong to any nationality in the world, though perfected and organised after the most approved revolutionary model, we must remember that it was these idealless, soulless worldlings, who are the objects of Mr. Carlyle's disparaging sentences,—the Scotts, and Burkes, and Johnsons,—who, winning the *intellectual* battle against the anarchists, saved their country even from engaging, much more from sinking, in the internecine *social* strife which ruined France. First, when the elements were getting electric, but the storm was still far off, came the English Johnson, confounding, like another Socrates, the sophists who were labouring to import and naturalise the Voltairian philosophy, and securing for the cause of the old and received ideas that intellectual ascendancy among the upper ranks of society which in France the scoffs of Voltaire and the heavy metal of the encyclopædic had transferred to the side of scepticism. Next, Burke the Irishman, when the thunder-cloud first broke, stood firm against the exciting influences of the heated atmosphere; and, addressing himself especially to the political question, demonstrated how empty and delusive were the current cries, how sordid the motives of their utterers; and predicted, with marvellous sagacity, the exact course of declension which the revolution would take. The last among these heroes of order was the Scotchman, Sir Walter Scott. In a somewhat different province of human affairs, he fought substantially the same battle which Johnson and Burke had fought before him. The elemental strife was now raging with doubtful event, and all the massiveness of his character, all the force of his will, all the resources of his mind, were employed to sustain British society under the exhausting

struggle, to harden and confirm the old and inveterate pertinacity of the race, to speak words of encouragement in dark days, and raise high the song of victory when fortune smiled once more. Of such a man it is not true to say, as Mr. Carlyle has said, that there is "nothing spiritual" about him; that all is "of the earth earthy." True, your Atlas makes less noise and turmoil than your Enceladus or Briareus; but these will, sooner or later, be whelmed under Mount Etna, and heard of no more, while the pillar which supports a world, the moral prop which stays society from rushing into ruin and collapse, will be valued more and more with the lapse of years, and consecrated to perpetual honour by the grateful veneration of posterity.

In our deliberate judgment, then, Scott's life was not that embodiment of ignoble self-seeking endeavour which Mr. Carlyle would represent it. And yet it cannot be denied that prosperity begat a certain hardness in him; and that, in the half-dozen years preceding the crash, even his own singular ideal, in itself not of the highest order, was partially overlaid and obscured by the heterogeneous machinery which he employed to realise it. No man has a right to be so intent on providing the means of life as to forget to live. The allegiance to law and established order was somewhat overdone, when it prompted a man like Scott to indite a minute and faithful narrative of the proceedings at the coronation of — George IV.! The solemn moral import of that antique ceremonial must have been forgotten in the admiration of its outward forms; else how could the mockery of such vows, taken by such a man, have failed to strike him? Again, the ideal end of the feudal relation between landlord and dependent ran no small risk, one would say, of being buried under a multiplicity of details, when the laird of Abbotsford came to think that his side of the relation required such floods of correspondence about upholstery, such a world of contrivance and negotiation about knick-nacks, as the letters to Terry and others exhibit. Scott aimed at more than that *sufficient* provision of temporal good which Aristotle defines to be, not an ingredient, but a collateral condition of happiness; and by a just retribution he found himself left with *less*.

In that day of supreme humiliation, Scott, we have always thought, played the man; sat calmly down amid the ruins of his pride, and acquitted himself as a brave and good man should. But it seems there was a yet more excellent way in which the disaster might have been met, and Mr. Carlyle would show us how to "gild refined gold." He might, it seems, have confessed himself vanquished,—owned

that he had been all along pursuing a false ideal,—and acquiesced in ruin, without an effort to repair its effects. He did not do so, but proudly and doggedly set himself to the vain task of reversing fate's decree and paying his creditors. This view assumes that his vanity, and the selfish part of his ambition, remained the same after his ruin as before it. But the facts recorded, the entries in his Diary, and the distinct testimony of Mr. Lockhart (vii. 408) contravene this assumption. We hear of no more grand receptions, no hospitable banquets *en grand seigneur*, no plate-glass windows or marble chimney-pieces. Hard stern work, habitual self-denial, take the place of all such vanities. To have acted otherwise, would, in our poor judgment, have argued, not humility, but dishonourable sloth. The “novel manufactory,” which Mr. Carlyle justly holds in no great respect, had long ministered to vanity; now it must minister to the discharge of those obligations with which vanity had burdened him. Nor would Scott have allowed, as neither do we, that his ideal had been altogether a perversion or a dream. “Some at least,” he says (Diary, 18th December 1825), “will forgive my transient wealth on account of the innocence of my intentions, *and my real wish to do good to the poor.*” But had the case been so, and had his eyes been opened as thoroughly as Mr. Carlyle could desire to the enormity of his errors, we still do not see why his conduct should have been different from what it was. The debts were due, whatever judgment might be passed upon the debtor; and if he chose to regard them from the point of view of a gentleman, instead of that of a trader, and resolved if he could to pay all, instead of availing himself of the bankruptcy law, and paying only part, is he to be censured for that? He forfeited health and life in the struggle; but what then? He is not truly unhappy who can say, *tout est perdu fors l'honneur*. What Burke calls “the chastity of honour” is not so universal among us as to make it becoming to deride and condemn one of the few whom the principle truly actuated.

The severity of Mr. Carlyle's tone, when estimating, in 1838, the character of Sir Walter, seems traceable to the theory which he then held concerning the true functions and dignity of the man of letters. The author of “Sartor Resartus” and of “Past and Present” would fain have invested the modern writer with the attributes of a Hebrew prophet; despairing of religion, he would have set up literature as the guide of life, made the author the only authentic preacher, and the publication of a book synonymous with the evangelisation of a people. “Literature,” he said, “has other

aims than that of harmlessly amusing indolent languid men ; or if literature have them not, then literature is a very poor affair." That there is much nobleness, and something of truth, in this theory, we would not deny ; and such works as " Past and Present," " Chartism," and " Hero-Worship," are memorable embodiments of it. That Scott, like Shakespeare, conceived of literature and its functions altogether differently, is most certain. He regarded it as a means ; Mr. Carlyle as an end. The responsibilities of literary gifts were perhaps underrated by the one ; but they were certainly overrated by the other. This radical discordance explains, we think, much of Mr. Carlyle's severity. Yet he should have been candid enough to allow that Scott might have an ideal, though he placed it elsewhere ; that there were earnest purpose and fixed direction in his life, although writing books was to him rather a pastime or a business than the fulfilment of a duty. Mr. Carlyle himself would seem to have changed his view as to the prophetic office of the man of letters. Admirable as is the execution of the *Life of Frederic*, its excellence is of a kind essentially literary ; it is addressed to the educated and critical few, and does not attempt, in the old prophetic vein, to sound and stir up from its depths the general human heart.

There is one aspect of Scott's mind of which we have hitherto said nothing,—we mean the religious aspect. Yet, although to a Catholic the account of the position which a man holds in regard to saving faith must ever seem the most momentous and permanently interesting portion of his life's history, it must be owned that in the present case such an inquiry would be found singularly sterile. It would be a great waste of time to investigate the religious convictions of Lord Burleigh or Maurice of Saxony ; and although, morally, Scott stood far above either, yet the reason why a religious biography of these worthies would be impracticable is at bottom the same which makes it useless to ask whether Scott approved of High Church or Low Church, whether he tended to Catholicism or swore by Calvin. The truth is, that Sir Walter was simply of the religion professed by the aristocratic and cultivated class in British society to which he belonged. In his time and country, that religion happened to be the Anglican form of Protestantism ; but whatever form it had been, he would probably have adhered to it. Though born and brought up in a rigid Presbyterian family, he attached himself when he grew to manhood to the Church of England, for no other reason, that we can discover, except that it was the religion of his king, of his literary friends, of

the leaders of society and the political chieftains in both countries, above all, because it was the religion of Buccleuch! The Catholic reader must not be surprised at finding here and there, in the diary and letters, severe and unjust expressions respecting the Church and her ritual. He will remember that Scott, able as he was, was destitute of "the philosophic mind;" and that although he may be implicitly trusted when he states a fact, his inferences from it, or attempts to account for it, are generally valueless. Thus, in writing to Joanna Baillie, after his visit to Ireland in 1825, he speaks of Catholicism as "a helpless sort of superstition," which "destroys ambition and industrious exertion;" and adduces in proof the fact that Irish Catholics seldom or never rise above the social station in which they were born. The fact was probably so in 1825; Scott was too shrewd to be deceived in a matter which had come under his own observation. But it is notoriously no fact in 1860, and yet the Irish are not less Catholic now than they were thirty-five years ago. Now, as the intervening period has been one of constant progress in the direction of the establishment of religious and civil equality between Catholic and Protestant, it may be probably inferred that the onerous restrictions and disabilities under which the Catholics formerly lay were the cause of the fact observed by Scott. At any rate, his own inference, from the fact to the character of the religion they professed, is shown to have been futile.

The innumerable passages in his works in which the faith and religious observances of Catholic ages are referred to without bitterness, and described with a certain reverence, prove nothing as to Scott's own religious tendencies. If, indeed, Bishop Tait or Bishop Philpotts were to handle "mediaeval superstitions" with the like tenderness, he would be considered as half-way on the road to Rome. But Scott deals with all religious manifestations simply as an artist; he finds in the Church history of the middle ages an exhaustless mine of picturesque material, and makes profitable use of it accordingly. Similarly he makes literary capital out of the lofty fanaticism of the Covenanters. There is, however, one trace of genuine personal feeling which it is pleasant to meet with; Scott always loved the Latin hymns of the Catholic ritual. In writing to Crabbe in 1814, he said, "To my Gothic ear, *Stabat Mater*, the *Dies Iræ*, and some of the other hymns of the Catholic Church are more solemn and affecting than the fine classical poetry of Buchanan." In his last illness, the almost divine music of those ancient strains lingered around his failing faculties. Speaking of the wanderings of

his delirium, Lockhart says, "We very often heard distinctly the cadence of the *Dies Iræ*, and, I think, the very last stanza that we could make out was the first of a still greater favourite:

"Stabat Mater dolorosa,  
Juxta crucem lacrymosa,  
Dum pendebat Filius."

Of the last sad years, from 1826 to 1832, we can give no account in detail; but there is a mournful tragic interest attaching to them, which makes the last two volumes of the *Life* impress us far more deeply than the records of the flowing tide of prosperity in the period which preceded them. Indeed, the effect of all this latter portion of Scott's life is deeply tragical,—using the word in the sense of Chaucer, who in the "Monk's Tale" defines a tragedy to be the history of a person, who having been raised up from a mean position to a great height of prosperity, is afterwards involved in misfortune, and comes to a ruinous and miserable end. Even so it is with Sir Walter Scott. As great as the rise had been, so great and overwhelming is the fall. In vain does the heroic man brace his already fading energies to the task of reconstruction; in vain does he "work double tides," and cut down to the lowest point all personal expenditure; in vain do pitying nations applaud the endeavour, and Scottish creditors, lifted above themselves by strong sympathy, transform themselves into the chivalrous and forbearing friends of their toiling debtor. All is in vain; the struggle is against time and circumstance, against nature's neglected laws; and it cannot be ultimately successful. Wonderful feats are performed, but the race is *not* won. Nature sinks beneath the strain; paralysis seizes upon the over-wrought powers; and the curtain falls upon a scene of quick decay, insensibility, and death.

One more extract descriptive of the last hours:

"As I was dressing on the morning of Monday the 17th of September, Nicholson came into my room, and told me that his master had awoke in a state of composure and consciousness, and wished to see me immediately. I found him entirely himself, though in the last extreme of feebleness. His eye was clear and calm—every trace of the wildfire of delirium extinguished. 'Lockhart,' he said, 'I may have but a minute to speak to you. My dear, be a good man—be virtuous—be religious—be a good man. Nothing else will give you any comfort when you come to lie here.' He paused; and I said, 'Shall I send for Sophia and Anne?' 'No,' said he, 'don't disturb them. Poor souls! I know they were up all night. God bless you all.' With this he sank into a very tran-

quill sleep, and, indeed, he scarcely afterwards gave any sign of consciousness. . . . . About half-past one P.M., on the 21st of September, Sir Walter breathed his last, in the presence of all his children. It was a beautiful day—so warm, that every window was wide open; and so perfectly still, that the sound of all others the most delicious to his ear, the gentle ripple of the Tweed over its pebbles, was distinctly audible as we knelt around the bed, and his eldest son kissed and closed his eyes."

We will not spoil this beautiful image of final peace by indulging in any further reflections on the busy life and manifold work of the illustrious dead. Much more might be said on both; but we have accomplished, however imperfectly, the task we undertook,—the attempt, namely, to show that Sir Walter Scott, in spite of what has been or may be urged against him as an author or as a man, was one of the most memorable persons of modern times; that his true greatness has been as yet inadequately acknowledged; and that, whatever may be the final sentence of criticism upon his writings, no blinding partiality guided Mr. Lockhart's pen, when at the conclusion of his work he designated its subject "A GREAT AND GOOD MAN."

---

## Communicated Articles.

### THE CHURCH AND SCIENCE.

#### I. THE EXACT SCIENCES.

BECAUSE the physical sciences do not demonstrate the existence of God, some physical philosophers deny Him. Nature, they say, is a law to herself, and needs no lawgiver; chemical laws act of themselves; electro-magnetism operates on matter in a gaseous state, solidifies it into masses, which it poises and balances, and so produces the mechanism of the universe—nowhere does the will or the action of a free personal God crop out. There is intelligence, but it is natural, not personal. Nature stands alone.

This, they tell us, is certain. Mathematics are inherent in matter, and do not depend on a mathematician, any more than physical forces on a Hercules, or chemical forces on a chemist. All is *thing*, nowhere do we find *person*. The *thing* is science. Mathematical, chemical, physical laws are realities that exist substantially in matter, and not intellectually in any supreme personal spirit.

But the philosophers who assert this are themselves mathematicians, chemists, naturalists. What law of nature gives them these characters? What distinguishes them from the things which they observe, study, and analyse? Whence this power of abstraction which makes them see things not visible on the surface? Do they get it from nature? Yes; from their *own* nature, not from external nature. What, then, is this nature so essentially distinct from external nature, that one knows and is conscious, while the other, with all its brute force, is blind, deaf, and lifeless? How can we get at the abstract science of mathematics,—not the mathematics inherent in matter, which we can imagine, but the mathematics abstracted from all matter, which we cannot imagine, but can employ?

Here, then, are two points which philosophers have to establish. How do they distinguish themselves from things, and know themselves to have a mind distinct from nature and the universe? and how do they prove the identity of science with reality, of the laws conceived in the mind with the laws incorporate in the world? Will they tell us that there is a material mind,—that mind is matter, and matter mind? Impossible! Matter is contrary to mind. Mind is myself, my person, in opposition to things. Perhaps, then, mind is an attribute of matter, a quality, an emanation, or a



possession, like the table-rapping force which it was lately the fashion to believe in? But there is no conceivable mind without freedom: matter does not possess mind, but mind possesses matter; matter does not constitute mind, but mind may in some degree spiritualise matter, by making it the expression and image of its thought.

Reality stares us in the face; the world, that wonderful combination of force and matter, is a reality. Chemistry informs us that the world has not existed as it is from all eternity—we know that matter was in a gaseous state before it was solid; science takes cognizance, not only of the existing world, but also of the world in process of formation, after the analogy of the decomposition and recomposition of any portion of matter. But science is brought up short at the limits of experience; it knows nothing beyond gas and the physical forces which lie at the base of the whole material universe—yes, it knows somewhat more. It can prove, or rather create, a *vacuum*. It can pump all gas, every particle of perceptible matter, out of a bell-glass. What is possible in a cubic foot is conceivable in universal space; thus the non-existence of the world is supposable, matter and physical force can both be annihilated. Science, then, can show, beyond the elements of the world, the existence of *vacuum*, or nothing. It has, then, to account for the existence of the world.

Let us now turn to the mind, and see how she manages to eliminate God. Reason, she says, shows us a chain of causes and effects in human affairs; she shows us a thinking soul, which *is* human nature, and which weaves in us the tissue of our thoughts and deeds. Here is no God; nothing but ourselves. We can fancy a God, but He will only be an abstraction of reason. Be it so. But reason also is an abstraction. How does it account for the person?

It is a great misapprehension, both of nature and of mind, to set up absolute reason as an independent quality, without any absolute mind in which it can inhere; to isolate the laws of matter, and to take the average of the laws of mind, and to form of these two an absolute reason, a kind of statistical total, or an arc of vibration,—a *laxum* within which every reason must move, a universal reason which is the type of each individual reason,—and then to set up this compound reason as the test of all truth, and thus to make nature and man the measure of all things. In doing so, we deny one half of nature and one half of mind. We completely overlook the *life* in nature, which endures no abstraction; and we overlook the imagination in the mind, the power which

sees and furnishes the reason with all its materials of reflection. Reason, then, is no independent being; it is a quality inherent in some substance.

These difficulties in the isolation of pure reason have forced others, who perceived the reality of the natural life which physical and mathematical science cannot reduce to any formula, and of the mental imagination of which logic can give no account, to form two other sciences,—biology, to unlock the mysteries of life, and æsthetics, poetry and art, to unlock the mysteries of the imagination. And then reason is to give a full account of reason, life of life, poetry of poetry, art of art; there is no mystery left to require the *Deus ex machina*. I will postpone the consideration of art and poetry without God, and inquire into the theory of life without any living God.

The scale of life ascends in a zigzag or spiral line, from the vegetable cell, through all the developments of the animal, up to man. Now what is the force which bridges over the gulf between the lifeless *thing* and the living *organism*, between mathematical crystallisation and biological growth? It is chemistry, said the scientific atheists of the eighteenth century: but the scientific atheists of the present day have been the first to combat this theory, to accuse their predecessors of deserting the road of experiment and induction, and of indulging in fanciful speculations; the modern idea is, that embryology is to provide the bridge, to account for the phenomena of life, and to trace the development of the thinking being from the rudimental cell.

I do not question the importance of the action of chemistry in the phenomena of life, and in the cerebral instruments of thought. Nobody denies the reality of the laws of organic chemistry which preside over the organisation of vegetables, animals, and men, or the distinction of these laws from those of inorganic chemistry, though the subject-matter of both is the same elementary matter, the same gases, earths, and metals. But organic matter is not life; no one has yet proved that life is, like heat, a product of electro-magnetic forces. I believe that the future discoveries of chemistry will be enormous; but I will defy all future chemists to produce the smallest seed, the least germ, the minutest animalcule, not to speak of the human embryo. If chemistry could work this miracle, I would own its divinity.

Life, like thought, is an unknown force, and electro-magnetism has nothing to do with it. 'Life and thought are creative; electricity only adds and divides, and acts on dead and inanimate masses. It disorders the living body, but cannot

produce it. It has nothing in common with the living thinking soul, the central creative form of the living body and of living thought. The "spark of life" is but a metaphor; the "electric spark" is a fact; vitality is a different thing from the heat of chemical decomposition. We can understand life springing from life; can we understand life springing from any other source?

To deny the existence of a personal God in relation with man and the world, is to profess to explain the world by physical science alone, and man by biology alone. The eighteenth century jumped all difficulties; it assumed a vacuum, space, and atoms, or ultimate and indivisible magnitudes. Then it brought in pressure, shock, chance, or the principle of time. From these data every thing else followed. Thought, the product of brain, sprung (so to say) from an electric discharge through man's head; sensation sprung from the same discharge passed through his nerves; ideas were images, thoughts were sensations; all of them were impressions, modifications, or motions of the brain or the nervous system. These notions are no longer current; but the men of science are still experimenting with more silence, but with no less hopes that chemistry will one day strike out the secret of thought and of life.

Throughout all this there is a constant element which these men dare not think about or attempt to explain; this element tells man that he is something different from all other visible beings. It is consciousness, which they dare not deny, though they will not confess it.

Each man knows himself to be a *me* distinct from all other *mes*; an individual, a person. Each of us has his individual personal consciousness, and a human consciousness besides. Whatever his nationality may be, the colour of his skin, or the form of his skull, each of us is conscious that he is a man, one of the human species, a constituent portion of mankind.

Beneath the *me*, beneath consciousness, we possess, in virtue of our organised body, a distinct force, which in the brutes is instinct, and which in them supplies the place of our consciousness. This is why our instinct is so much weaker than that of brutes; for we have a substitute for it in consciousness. And as we share instinct with the brutes, so do we participate in the vegetative principle of plants. The brute has more vegetative force than we, but less than the plant; our vegetation is inferior to that of the brute, our instinct inferior to his: our superiority lies in our consciousness; it alone raises us above the sphere of all animal and vegetable life, and carries us into the realms of spirit, which belong to

a third order of things. The first order, that of physical chemistry, ends with the edifice of the universe. The second, that of life, pervades the vegetable, the animal, and the human kingdoms. The third, or spiritual order, stands by itself; for its principle is not to be found in either of the other orders. Or perhaps some philosopher would be kind enough to inform me what it is that develops matter into life, and then develops life into thought.

Some will tell us that there is a threefold soul, the soul of the world, the vital soul, and the thinking soul—any thing rather than admit God, the Soul of souls.

This theory exceeds the bounds both of pure physics and of pure reason. It is a kind of mysticism to intrude a soul of the world into the order of the physical, chemical, and mathematical sciences, or a vital soul into the order of biology and anatomy, or a thinking soul into the order of psychology, philology, history, morals, and social science. It removes us from the platform of materialism and of rationalism, but it lands us anew on the platform of naturalism under another shape. What is the nature of this threefold soul? Is it one or is it three? and what are the relations between the mechanical soul which moves the machine of the universe, balances its motions, and sounds the strokes of time, the vital soul, which grows in the vegetable, acts in the animal, and feels in man, and the thinking soul, which has the idea of universals, and possesses self-consciousness?

A soul of the world can never be proved. How can a machine have a soul? The ancients never thought of the world as of a machine; they considered it to be a living, even a lung-breathing animal. Science has discovered the *méchanique céleste*, and since Newton's days the idea of a living Pan has been exploded. Now, no machine can make itself; the burden of proof is with those who think it can: but the proof is impossible; there is no machine without a maker. The ancients knew this well when they spoke of the Demiurge, the architect or workman of the world. I own the existence of a vital soul; but we must come to an understanding about the exact sense of the word 'soul.' Beasts have souls; it is a gross mistake of Descartes to make them mere machines. The soul of the animal is obscured and fettered by instinct, utterly without self-consciousness, but with sentiments and passions, and with the power of instinctive action. We cannot say that plants have souls; but they live after their own fashion. The soul in my sense is something more than vegetative or perceptive—it thinks. The true soul is that which lives and feels and thinks. It slumbers like the plant, it has passions

like the animal; but it also rises above the order of the world by its reason, which discovers the system of the universe, conceives the idea of the world, and thus transcends its limits; for it raises itself towards a higher and living Reason, which is not abstract, like the human understanding, but realises the contents of its eternal thought, which creates the world, and multiplies its image in the human soul.

Consciousness may be obscured, but not extinguished; if it were, manhood would be extinguished too, and only a brute nature would remain; and not even that, for the instinctive infallibility which characterises the brute would be wanting. Man's instincts do not wax as his self-consciousness wanes.

The ancients, as we said, considered the soul of the world to be a living being, an animal, a ζῷον, gifted with intelligence, which was a harmonious νοῦς according to Plato and Pythagoras, or a mechanical νοῦς according to Aristotle. In the system of our modern scientific atheists, who substitute *the divinity* for God, the soul of the world is not such as the ancients conceived it; the divinity is something impersonal, which flashes in the electric spark, acts in chemical combinations, and moves in the harmonious mechanism of the system of the world. This divinity, which is neither a divine soul, nor a first mover of the heavens, nor the living God, is a mere word, set up to hide a pure vacuum. It is something immeasurably beneath the idea which the ancients formed of a soul of the world after the analogy of the human soul, moving the body of the universe as our soul moves our body—the idea was false, because it is founded on a false analogy; but it nevertheless contains the germs of the highest truth.

For this God, innate in the body of the universe, and at once its demiurge and its νοῦς, who makes the world His home, and clothes Himself with it as with a living body, expresses, however imperfectly, the idea of a providence, a system whereby the world is upheld. It is quite true that the world is in God, ideally; and it is true that God is in the world, because He upholds it. It is quite true that, in some sublime sense, God is that Pole of the universe around whom the stellar nebulae revolve, with their numberless suns and planetary systems. But He is not the Soul of the world which the ancients conceived, contained in the world and inseparable from it, nor is He the *divinity* invented by certain philosophers to explain the threecfold mysteries of nature, life, and thought; a sort of mechanical living and thinking gas,—or rather guess, for the science of its inventors cannot furnish a single proof of it, and their assertion of it only shows that they are less ashamed to own their ignorance than

to confess the true God. They will not acknowledge any thing beyond or above nature, and they say that the divinity is nature, or rather the progress of nature, beginning with the machine of the universe, advancing towards the living organism of plants and animals, and perfecting itself in the self-consciousness of man.

But experiment throws down all this scaffolding, by discovering a vacuum from which every particle of matter is excluded, and where, therefore, the forces of electricity have no play. Experiment, therefore, proves the existence of absolute vacuum, or nothing. Once more, therefore, whence comes this thing, or the universe? out of nothing? But your first principle is, "*Ex nihilo nihil.*" You say that there is no God. You prove experimentally that there *was* no nature, for you have substituted vacuum for it. How, then, do you account for the beginning of things?

You appeal afresh to experience. Every thing, you say, proceeds from nature. There we may trace to an indefinite extent a double set of phenomena, the composition of elements and the metamorphosis of the embryo. Chemistry and anatomy unfold these mysteries. They unfold a process of nature, but no miracle. But the act of creation, as you suppose it to be, is a miracle, absolutely distinct from all processes of nature. *Fiat lux, et facta est lux*, is only darkness for science.

This they attempt to prove somewhat in this way: In nature every thing has its law, therefore every thing is necessary. Nothing ever deviates from its plan, or wanders from its path. But if you admit the volition and operation of a mind, you immediately introduce the action of free-will. Will, then, can only be admitted on the condition of not willing at all, or of adhering rigidly to a predetermined plan. But however determined the will may be, however strong the character, will necessarily implies the faculty of altering one's plan, and changing one's direction. Without this, will is no longer will, but fatality; and from the liberty of God we come down to the necessity of nature.

Further, if God's freedom was entire, how could we help thinking that He might create trees with red instead of green leaves, or give men horses' heads? Why should He not alter every thing, and interfere arbitrarily in His work? The schoolmen who have spoken of the will and power of God in this spirit were more faithful to the dogma of the Creator's freedom than those who argued from His wisdom that He could not do otherwise than He has done, because all that He has done is wise. This is the pretext on which certain phi-

losophers refuse to account for the production of nature out of nothing, when they cannot deny the fact of the vacuum.

It is certain that absurd fancies entered the heads of several of the scholastic theologians: some lost themselves in subtleties; others, for want of taste, caricatured their thoughts and expressions. Some ascetics had eyes only for the world of spirits; nature appeared to some of them a superfluity, to others a curse, and to others a prison. They seem to have unintentionally forgotten that man was made in the image of God, not God in the image of man. They did not understand that the absolute freedom of God is identical with His absolute wisdom and will; that His wisdom is law, admitting of no capricious change. It is good to compare an image to its type; but we should never forget that man is no exact copy of God. He is God's creature, partaking of His likeness, but not of His divinity. Man's will is no adequate resemblance of the Divine wisdom.

Other philosophers object, that though divines see nothing but wisdom in God's creation, yet they completely misunderstand its meaning and its wisdom. They pretend that God can contradict His own laws, that He can interfere on all occasions with the regular order of the universe, can change the eternal course of the stars, and can overturn the whole system of His providence; not, indeed, capriciously or arbitrarily, but for some end of His own, often merely to make Himself known or feared by man. These philosophers are in their glory, when they meet with theologians who distinguish thesis from *hypothesis*; who admit the system of Copernicus or of Newton, of Lyell or of Herschel, as *hypothesis*, but deny it as *thesis*, and so pretend that there can be no dogmatic infallibility of science, but only the dogmatic infallibility of the Church. This objection deserves attention.

First, then, I observe, that it confuses two orders of things, not opposed to one another, but radically distinct. The Church is not built on her physical, chemical, and mathematical teaching,—her object is man, not nature. She teaches that God created the world; the different conceptions of the world that prevailed among the Jews, the pagans, the mediæval Christians, and the schools of modern science since the times of Copernicus are nothing to her. There are grand guesses, splendid presentiments, immortal ideas, in the ancient and mediæval systems of physics, but no proper science. If I may say so, it appears to me that God comes out much greater in the system of modern science than in the innocent simplicity of the ancient systems. His wisdom shines incomparably brighter in the telescopic masses and microscopic atoms of modern

science, in the celestial mechanism and in the embryo; His immensity strikes us dumb with awe and adoration. But these things speak to very few; their practical importance is small; the simple method of contemplating nature as the senses represent it, will always convey a deeper moral lesson than all the lore of chemistry and mathematics. Now the Church is for the many, not for the few.

I mean this as an answer to the chemists and meteorologists, who protest against good Christians praying for the cessation of drought or deluge. They know quite well that God does not disturb the deep harmonies of the world to deliver man from his occasional discord with the course of nature. But there is a mighty difference between those deep harmonies and the accidental variations of the atmospherical changes which affect us. Those who mock at these prayers are like Voltaire, who annihilated man in comparison to the world, not because he doubted his own greatness, but because he liked to rob the sufferer of the idea that God would stoop to so lowly a creature, and to tell him, that so far from being king of the universe, man was not even king of the earth. "Worm," he seemed to say, "art thou vain enough to fancy that God thinks of thee, or can even distinguish such an infinitesimal atom as thou art, when He is engaged in rolling in their orbits the multitudinous worlds, of whose very existence thou art ignorant?" I need scarcely observe that these mockers, who degrade man beneath matter, and laugh at him for believing that he bears the image of God and is called to the knowledge of God and of the world, are by no means behindhand in believing in their own dignity, and in their original superiority to the rest of men. They have overcome all the oldest superstitions of mankind; they are immeasurably above their fellow-creatures, who are weak enough to believe in a personal God. There is nothing, they say, superior to nature. They are too modest; for they forget that nature is unconscious, and that they are above nature, because they know it and understand it. They are therefore superior to the globes of matter.

But seriously; these philosophers who confine themselves to their own science, and feel a supreme contempt for all theology and metaphysics, what do they know outside the limits of their science? As naturalists, chemists, mathematicians, biologists, and anatomists, they are great in all that concerns the material world; but without knowledge of God, how can they know man? They know, perhaps, that man is a social and political being, that he can learn, and become as eminent in science as themselves. But what do they know



of man as a religious, free, moral, and intellectual being? nay, what real knowledge have they of man as a social and political being? And with such profound ignorance of man's real value, his true nature and character, how can they decide on the relation of man with God? Granting, as we must, that God does not change the laws of the world to please men, how do they know that there is no true connection, no real communication between God and man; that prayer is in vain, and that man's relations to the world are such as preclude God's interfering in his favour without violating the laws of the creation? I know not, I affirm not; but I believe. How do they know, how can they affirm the contrary? Outside the limits of his experience, what can man ever know of nature?

But besides this miracle of God's answering prayers, there are others, they tell us, which are, if possible, still more offensive to philosophic ears. The grace of sanctity seems partially to free a man from the usual organic conditions of the body in his elevations and his ecstasies; his body seems for a time to live in an exceptional state, and to be more or less absorbed into a sphere of action unknown to natural agents: all this, they say, is in plain contradiction with the natural condition of mankind.

Another objection,—they deny all diabolical influence; no devil can bring man into contact with any evil powers that people the world, and that can draw him beyond the natural sphere of his bodily existence. Here, again, they tell us, faith and the Church disturb the order of things, contradict all our knowledge of the natural powers of the human body, and confuse a vast chain of cause and effect which experience reveals to us.

I think we may answer, that the miraculous sanctity given by God's grace, and the miraculous abomination of diabolical possession, are objects of popular belief in all the religions of the world. The Old and New Testaments are not the only sacred books which assume the reality of man's being sometimes possessed by a spirit, whether of good or of evil, and of the effects which this possession causes either in the human subject or in those who approach him. Paganism, in its own way, is full of this kind of manifestations, as is also the Koran in its way. This fact alone proposes to science a problem both of psychology and of physiology, and when that is settled, a still more obscure problem of those mysterious forces whereby the soul acts on the body, and whose inexplicable currents act on the vital forces in the normal state of slumber, and in the abnormal state of nervous and hysterical

affections. Psychology, physiology, and medicine record many facts in man, while biology records many more in other living beings, which would puzzle the naturalist, the chemist, or the anatomist to account for.

A great deal has been said about *animal magnetism*, the very name of which shows the determination to view it as a function of common electro-magnetism. By this gate men have tried to penetrate the sphere of the unknown; and we have seen some who denied a God, and thought that soul was only a natural phenomenon, renewing a kind of religion of witches and sorcerers, similar to that of Epicurus and his herd. Still we must own that only a few *savants* have tried to make any scientific application of animal magnetism. The rest have formally denied its reality, and have pronounced all the pretended phenomena of sympathy, antipathy, and clairvoyance to be hallucinations, dreams, fanaticisms, or impostures, like all the other miracles which men work either by grace or by the power of evil spirits.

It must be owned that there are certain exceptional states of physical nervousness or of moral unhealthiness to be found not only in single men, but at times also in the masses. There are periods when whole nations seem subject to a moral over-excitement, which unhinges the soul. You may find manifestations of purity, innocence, and simplicity mixed up with symptoms of an epidemic madness. The history of pagan sects is full of examples; in Judaism they are rare, owing to the rigidity of the Mosaic law, and the strictness of its discipline. The phenomena reappeared in full force among the Christian sects, both before and after the age of Constantine, several times in the middle ages, and among the Protestant mystics, reaching, though with diminished force, quite into the days of modern Europe. Mahometanism has not escaped the influence, any more than the Bonzes of China and the followers of Lao-Tsen. Its effects, both moral and physical, have ever been unhealthy. Generally man's earthly vocation is to ceaseless toil, both of mind and body; it is only savage and uncivilised men who abandon themselves to dreams and hallucinations. Our fancy, our intuition, our self-consciousness, our love, and the mystical elements of our imagination, heart, and mind, have other objects to aim at than the dreamy state of nervous irritability, which, on occasion, should be studied by physiologists and psychologists, theologians, philosophers, and even politicians; but which is the disgrace of the classes who call themselves enlightened, when they give way to these chimerical fancies. Then science can only, as it were, suck its thumbs; for, apart from all imposture and self-deception, the

facts are of such a character as to offer no opening to scientific investigation.

To resume. It is certain that the system of worlds is the effect of absolute wisdom, and is quite different from the work of a human mechanic, whose machine, however perfect it may be, is always wanting repair. It is certain also that the variations of the atmosphere have their causes, which are being elucidated by meteorology, and the investigation of the ocean-currents. Moreover, the discovery of nebulae in the most distant regions of space seems to prove that the creation is not yet finished; that new formations of worlds may yet be progressing, just as terrestrial bodies are continually decomposing and being recomposed. All that began in time is developed in time; nothing is eternal but God, and that which He makes after the image of His eternity. Matter, and the fount of life, are alike inexhaustible, fathomless as the thought of God, by which they were created. Only that which man makes soon comes to an end; and we have no reason to stand aghast at the relative infinity of space and time; for it has nothing moral in it, and therefore nothing that has any relationship with eternity.

Honour, therefore, to science in all its branches, and in all its discoverers,—in Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Herschel, Laplace, Lavoisier, Cuvier, Volta, Davy, Owen, and Faraday. The more it enlarges its field, the farther it examines into chemical and organic mechanism, the more it studies the embryo and looks into the depths of life, the more it will glorify the One Spirit without whom the Universe is simply unthinkable; for mere matter, which is no universe at all, is the only thing that is physically demonstrable.

There was once a time, happily long past, when theology overstepped her limits, and pretended to lay down the law for sciences, and to be her own naturalist, chemist, mathematician, astronomer, geologist, anatomist, and zoologist; in virtue of the natural history, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, geology, anatomy, and zoology, which she fancied might be found in Scripture. The middle age was educated in the Ptolemaic system, and what little physical science it possessed was all derived from Aristotle. The few minds which tried to advance a step from this tradition excited the suspicion of the masses,—like Pope Sylvester II., Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon,—and were secretly accused of magic and sorcery, and of selling themselves to the devil. The age of Copernicus and Galileo had dropped these suspicions; but it had adopted the subtlety of the “dogmatic thesis” and “scientific hypothesis;” the subterfuge of a scholasticism which was unwillingly

retreating before the advance of science. In later days, some men of science, intoxicated with their discoveries, thought they could do without God and the Church. The middle ages and the renaissance saw certain philosophers with their philosophy perish at the stake, in the name of God and of religion. The French Revolution, in retaliation, erected its scaffolds, where, in the name of reason, science, and experience, it beheaded the professors of religious faith as permanent conspirators against the peace and safety of mankind. But neither the fagot nor the guillotine effected any thing for religion or for science.

We no longer burn men or kill them in the name of religion and philosophy, though there is no knowing how far we might go,—priests as well as philosophers, and philosophers as well as priests; for I would not answer for the *savants*, when once they are committed to a theory. But I hope that the time either for a holy Inquisition or for a committee of public safety is gone for ever, and that no Robespierre or Torquemada will ever look upon the sun again. But the stake and the guillotine are not the worst; they never exterminated an idea, or cut off the head of an opinion; they only made martyrs for the causes they tried to crush. Religion and science have other difficulties and perils ahead of them.

Not to enlarge upon the yoke which continental governments are trying to impose on science and religion, on the pretence that the business of the state is to regulate them,—to see that they do not compromise public security, to subject them to a censorship, to submit them to a grossly material kind of moral and intellectual police, and thus by a slow fire to burn them out from the ranks of believers and students,—we have principally to fear the mutual follies of theologians and men of science, and the consequent follies of the ignorant multitudes who believe themselves religious when they curse science, and scientific when they despise religion, and toss about accusations of impiety or hypocrisy. The middle ages and the renaissance were horribly foul-mouthed, both in the school and cloister; celebrated pontiffs and doctors were brimful of outrageous epithets and abominable invectives, which would bring the moderns into the police-courts and the prisons; but these institutions did not exist in those days, when might made right, whether it was force of fist or violence of tongue.

But we must not be deceived in the calm attitude of the moderns; passion still survives: some look upon every scientific man who inclines to materialism or pantheism as half, if not wholly, a felon; while the other side can see nothing in

the religious man but either a knave or a fool. Condorcet, Laplace, and Lagrange, though as astronomers and mathematicians they only followed the road opened by Descartes, Leibnitz, and Newton, called them fools for their religion, and argued that Newton was mad from his commentary on Daniel. I know that this language has been wonderfully softened, and that few men of any merit now hold it; but these few are too many, the fire still lives beneath the ashes. Still, what we have now to guard against is not foulness, but emptiness of speech.

Rhetoric flourished in the mediæval schools,—it was a legacy of the Roman empire, whose cæsars systematically smothered all great jurisprudence, political science, philosophy, and all true theology,—even stoicism and platonism, and paganism itself, were too true for them,—and all metaphysics. For thought is always under misprision of treason in the eyes of a power which would rule men's minds; when they will not let you think, they will teach you to speak: hence came the rhetoric of the *littérateurs* of the Lower Empire, whose grammarians and other writers blocked up all the avenues of the middle ages.

I quite recognise the genius of the great apologists of Christianity, and of the chief fathers, whether Greek or Latin; I recognise also the genius of the schoolmen and canonists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In moral and intellectual greatness they may boldly measure themselves against any thing that antiquity can show, even without taking into consideration the purity of heart and wisdom of mind which they had derived from Christianity. But they lived in unlucky times for the development of language. They inherited the declamation and rhetoric of the cæsarian writers. The language of the Church was no more biblical than that of law was classic; both styles foamed over with those useless words and conventional phraseology which add nothing to the force of thought or the strength of expression. It was in spite of the disadvantages of their rhetorical education that there were so many great thinkers, and occasionally great writers, whether fathers or schoolmen, in the annals of the Church.

The renaissance did good service in restoring the real classical models. The language of the civil law came gradually to throw off the chains of the Lower Empire, though the renaissance loaded it with the new fetters of a Ciceronian and pedantic phraseology. In France, since the time of Montesquieu, the language of law has become what it should be,—has shaken off its phrases and periphrases, and much of

its old tumid rhetoric. Unhappily the language of theology has not followed the example set by the grand Bossuet, the classic and elegant Fenelon, and the terse Bourdaloue. It is not so much scholasticism which loads and lumbers it, as that rhetorical amplification and unctuous turgidity which adds nothing whatever to the meaning of language. Nothing can be indifferent which regards the Church either in her struggles with human thought and expression, with policy, with revolutions, and with the developments of social states; or in her relations with science, and with the totality of our knowledge of the nature of things.

To set up altar against altar, to oppose a doctrine of science to a doctrine of faith, would be to cause the most lamentable schisms that could divide mankind. All truths are in harmony; no truth contradicts a truth: but there are different orders of truth. There is the divine order, the natural order, the human order,—all with their different sides, their several relations; but with no contradictions. The business of the Church is to find her true position here, and to aspire once more, though in a different spirit, to place theology at the head of human science; not to domineer over science or to dogmatise about it, but to penetrate it, to adopt its discoveries, to understand the world as well as it understands God or man. But to do this, it must first learn to simplify its language; clearness of expression is necessary for clearness of thought; all rhetoric and turgidity is out of place.

If the Church makes these advances towards science, and learns to penetrate and understand it, science will be forced to make advances towards her, and to study and comprehend her. Science may still smile at the devout simplicity which likens the Creator to a mechanic who destroys and restores his work, or at the infantine notion of the intervention of God and the saints in the commonest events of nature. But science, when narrowly examined, will soon bring the *savants* to the end of their wisdom on all the greatest and most important questions. Science is encircled and blockaded with enigmas; she has no key except for what she composes and decomposes; she has not the keys of the laws of the universe, not even for those of electro-magnetism. She knows gases, but not the *materia prima*. She may deny miracles, though she can hardly deny creation,—the chief of all miracles; but she must acknowledge the enigmas; even worse, she must own that she has no answer to give them.

If any thing ought to bring back men to God, it is the serious study of nature. It did so, in a certain way, with the

greatest men of antiquity, Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. In another way it did so with Copernicus, Kepler, and even Galileo. It did so with a man who had studied all the deepest problems of mental and physical science, the great Leibnitz. If men like Lagrange and Laplace have remained infidels, it only shows some defect in their great genius. Their disciples will smile at me; they think that it shows want of common sense in Newton to argue from the mechanism of the universe to the Maker. Let them smile: if they have any thing to teach us, let us go to school to them; let us thank them for what they know, and lament their ignorance of what they do not acknowledge. They will laugh at us, and tell us that we are unscientific, uncritical. No matter. They cannot subtract a grain of credit from the scientific authority of Copernicus or Kepler, Newton or Leibnitz; nor can they add a grain of credit to their unhappy denial of God, which comes, in fact, to a denial of man. Let us own them to be great naturalists, if they are so; let us own that they have some parts of a scientific genius, but not all,—God is wanting.

The knowledge of nature is only one side of the modern science; the other side is the knowledge of man under all the variations of time, climate, and condition,—a knowledge which the ancients and mediæval philosophers possessed but imperfectly, but which has grown up since the era of Columbus, Gama, and the Jesuit missions, and has found most delicate instruments of investigation in comparative philology, and in the study of the beliefs, manners, customs, institutions, and origin of nations. By these it has put a new face on biblical, classical, and barbarian antiquity, and has grappled with all the questions of the migration, the colonisation, and the establishment of the various races of men. I will attempt in a future paper to show the relations of this curious renovation of human history with the Church, which alone possesses the keys of human nature, and is preëminently historical, because she gives the answer to the enigma of our existence.

LE BARON D'ECKSTEIN.

---

---

### THE LIMITS OF OUR THOUGHT.

THE question, What are the necessary limits of human thought? first started by Locke, but first scientifically treated by Kant, and recently forced upon the attention of the thoughtful world in the writings of Sir William Hamilton

and his disciple Mr. Mansel, is certainly the most momentous, if it be not also the most interesting, in all philosophy. The whole history of metaphysics, from its dawn in early Greece until our own days, is the history of a protracted contest, waged with various success, between a dogmatism which would enlarge and a scepticism which would narrow the domain of reason; but it is the merit of modern philosophy to have propounded the only question which can possibly lead to a final issue—What are the limits of cognition? How far can we reason with certainty, and where begins the region of shadows and illusions?

The proper domain of scientific knowledge, according to Kant, is the region of possible experience; its boundary-line the ideas of time and space, which are the forms of sensible intuition. Now there are three grand objects of human belief, he tells us, which cannot be subjected to the conditions of time and space, and which must be consequently regarded as outside the legitimate sphere of human cognition; and these are, substance (material and immaterial), the universe or nature (in its totality), and the Sovereign Being. These are merely subjective ideas, which the reason frames for the purpose of giving a unity and consistency to our thought within the region of possible experience; but they cannot be realised as existent objects for the purposes of speculation; and the practical proof of this is, that the attempt at any thing of the kind immediately betrays us into paralogsms and paradoxes, into illegitimate conclusions and self-contradictions, as a sort of punishment attendant on the ambition to be overwise. For, to take the human soul as an example of the first idea, its immateriality, immortality, and personality can be neither proved nor disproved by speculative arguments, neither can the existence of God (the third idea) be proved or disproved by the speculative reason. But the attempt to speculate on the second idea, of nature or the universe, results not merely in paralogsms, but in downright contradictions. It can be proved, on the one hand, that the world began to exist in time and is limited in space; but, on the other hand, it can be equally counter-proved that the world is eternal in duration and unlimited in space. It can be proved, that whatsoever is compounded in the world is compounded of insoluble elements; it can be counter-proved that no such insoluble elements exist, but only and always the compound. It can be proved that man is necessitated in his actions; it can be counter-proved that he is free. And lastly, it can be proved that either within or without the universe a Necessary Being exists as its Cause; but it can be also equally counter-proved



that the universe has no such cause. These contradictory conclusions, thus briefly stated, are argued out with great subtlety and ingenuity in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, the materials from which they are elaborated being amongst the most knotty questions in all philosophy: How could creation begin in time; did not rather time begin with creation? How could it begin at some point or epoch in eternity, since eternity has no such points or epochs, being "*sicut punctus cujus pars non est*" ?\* How about the endless question of the divisibility of matter? How is human liberty consistent with the necessity of causation? These are no questions of to-day or yesterday; they have been in all ages the torment of philosophy. If, then, the instructed reader refuses to admit the paralogsms which Kant attached to the realisation of the first and third ideas, and hesitates, as he well may, to admit the full list of paradoxes affixed to the second, urging that the sceptical conclusion is sometimes due to that subjective account of thought which is the radical defect of the Kantian metaphysics (as when, for instance, the law of causation is robbed of its proof of the existence of God); yet, on the whole, he must admit that in his *Antilogies of Reason* (as they are called) Kant has not, in his own words, "played a sophistical game," but that philosophy has set more riddles than philosophy can answer, and hence has become a by-word for confusion and contradiction. What are we to conclude, then, argues the philosopher of Königsberg, from these *Antilogies*, but that the Creator has limited the application of reason to the world of possible experience, within which so long as the speculator is content to confine himself, its conclusions are clear and certain; but that if he dare trespass beyond the appointed bourne, Reason herself will be the first to protest against the outrage, answer his inquiries with a double tongue, and leave him to grope his way in darkness? This decision so treats the opposed combatants in philosophy as to allow on the one hand no boast of glorious victory, and on the other to oblige no confession of inglorious defeat; but both were right and both wrong: right, inasmuch as the conclusions on either side were in accordance with reason; wrong, inasmuch as Reason herself, consulted on matters in which she has no proper jurisdiction, was, as a consequence, no trustworthy guide. And as to those grand objects of human faith, which seem compromised by such a conclusion, Kant reminds us that such truths as human liberty, immortality, and the existence of God, rest on other grounds than these school-proofs, which after all were not what really convinced men that they are free, immortal, and

\* St. Thomas, *Summ.* 1, q. 10, 1 ad 1m.

under the government of God, but were merely so many ingenious efforts to justify to the reason conclusions already suggested by our moral nature; in short, it is in the practical as opposed to the speculative reason that we must find a solid basis for the grand objects of human belief.

The grand aim of Kant in his paralogisms and antilogies was to put an end to licentious speculation; but his disciples soon disdained the narrow limits of time and space which he had prescribed as its boundaries. Fichte was even persuaded that to saddle the master-mind with contradictions was a blunder, and that in his Antilogies Kant's object was not to clog speculation, but to indicate its only proper channel—the thinking subject; nor was he undeceived until Kant himself made a formal protest against so arbitrary an interpretation of his teaching.\* Later on, Herbart (whose whole philosophy was inspired by the Antilogies) argued that these contradictions, far from being obstructive, are rather provocative of speculation; that they are the mainspring of philosophy, which only energises in order to solve them; and to let them stand over unsolved would result in the paralysis of reason. In vain Jacobi had protested that our transcendental ideas, which form the mind's true riches, are, like the impressions of sense, to be taken as facts, and not made the objects of a prurient speculation, lest we come to trifle them away altogether.† What, in a word, was the main scope of the German philosophy, from Kant (exclusively) to Hegel, but an attempt to reconcile contradictions? This reconciliation was effected by Hegel himself, who defined philosophy to be “the science of the identity of the identical and the non-identical.” It was this climax of absurdity which has brought about the retrograde movement, and philosophy asks once more, “What are the limits of human cognition?”

To speak now of the modification of Kant's theory proposed by Sir W. Hamilton. In his Antilogies (we hear no more of the paralogisms, for where Kant only found paralogisms his present disciples find contradictions) Kant had made the speculative reason contradict itself, and had thrown the burden of proving a supra-mundane order of things upon the practical reason. But this Sir William Hamilton maintains was a fatal step; for if the reason cannot be trusted in its speculative relations, neither can it be trusted in its practical relations; mendacious in one aspect, why veracious in another? and thus there is no escape from downright scepticism. But in these Antilogies Kant almost hit upon the “law of the conditioned,” viz. that the conceivable, which is

\* Chalybäus, *History of Speculative Philosophy*, lect. vi. † Ib. lect. iii.

identical with the conditioned, is always the mean between two inconceivable (contradictory) extremes, of which, however, as contradictories, one or the other must be true. Its lamented author gives three examples in illustration of his theory, which he had barely sketched; they are, as follows, taken from time, space, and causation. We cannot conceive time as infinite, but neither can we conceive it as finite, though one or the other it must be; what we can and do really conceive is an indefinite time. So with space. We cannot conceive infinite space,—such a thought is quite beyond us; but neither, on the other hand, can we think space as finite—realise any end of space, although finite or infinite it must be; what we really conceive is an indefinite space. And so, lastly, with causation. We cannot conceive the absolute commencement of existence *out of nothing*, no more than we can conceive its absolute reduction into nothing—annihilation; but, on the other hand, we are just as unable to conceive its absolute non-commencement: and hence our idea of causation; for since we cannot conceive the phenomenon to have actually begun to be, we are forced to allot it a state of existence prior to its manifestation, and such a state of existence is what we call a cause.\* Thus the intelligible is always limited and conditioned by the intelligent, and every conceivable bounded on either side by inconceivables, that is, by contradictories in thought. Sir W. Hamilton thought, that the greatest work he had achieved for philosophy was his explanation of the antilogies so as to save the reason from being convicted of mendaciousness in its highest potency;† for it no longer says, as with Kant, affirming and denying, “The world is eternal and infinite, the world is temporal and finite; matter is simple, and matter is compound in its constitutive elements; I am free, I am not free,”—thus contradicting itself; but it says, “I cannot conceive the world as eternal and infinite, neither can I conceive it as temporal and finite, yet one or the other it must be. I cannot conceive matter as essentially simple, nor can I conceive it as essentially compound, yet one or the other it must be. I cannot conceive myself free, but neither can I conceive myself not free in my actions, yet one or the other I must be.” The speculative reason is thus shown to be weak indeed, but not mendacious; and it is hereby left open to the practical reason to prove the grand objects of natural faith by arguments based on the constitution of our moral nature; and the inconsistency of Kant is avoided. Human reason, then, within its legiti-

\* Sir W. Hamilton, *Lectures*, vol. ii., lect. xxxix.

† Ibid. vol. i. Appendix (v).

mate sphere, the conditioned, does not contradict itself; but how, when it goes out to speculate beyond the sphere of the conditioned, if it would, for instance, attempt the knowledge or try to construct a science about the Absolute Being? Then there is no help for it; but contradictions of the most glaring kind will be the inevitable result. The very start would suppose such a contradiction, viz. that the finite could measure the Infinite, or that, while to think is itself to condition, there can be any thought of the Unconditioned or Absolute, precisely as such.\* Here Kant and Sir W. Hamilton are at one; they both deny the possibility of the sciences of ontology and rational theology in denying a cognition of the Absolute Being, who is the basis of both these sciences. But the contradictions which are supposed to forbid the construction of any science whatsoever, however imperfect and inadequate, of natural theology are exhibited by Mr. Mansel in his Bampton Lectures on "The Limits of Religious Thought." Perhaps the importance of the subject will justify me in going into this part of my subject at some length.

The primary conceptions of the Deity are chiefly three: He is absolute, He is cause, and He is infinite; and these, Mr. Mansel maintains, are to our minds contradictory conceptions. The Absolute, in the genuine sense of the word, signifies that which exists of itself, and by itself, and out of relation with any other being. Far other is our conception of cause; for while the Absolute can only be conceived as out of relation, the cause can only be conceived as in relation with somewhat else—with the effect; for cause and effect, as relative and correlative, cannot be conceived asunder, the cause being cause of the effect, the effect effect of the cause. Hence by thinking the Deity as cause, we bring Him into the very relationship which we had forbidden in thinking Him absolute.† But for awhile this contradiction may be

\* To say that the mind thinks the Absolute and Infinite, is it a contradiction? I distinguish with St. Augustine (Ep. 147, ad Paulinam), "*Aliud est videre, aliud totum videndum comprehendere; totum comprehenditur videndo, quod ita videatur ut nihil ejus lateat videntem.*" In the very idea of a Necessary is implied *that* He is absolute,—exists of Himself, and out of necessary relationship with another; but *how* He so exists we know not. And, again, it is implied in the same idea *that* He is infinite—*only implied*; for the mind cannot embrace, comprehend the Infinite: "*Hoc solum omnino de Ipso comprehendi potest nempe quod immensus et infinitus est.*" Is it still contradictory that the finite can in any sense think the Infinite? Not more so than that an unextended soul can be joined to or can perceive an unextended body—*contradictions to our ignorance*. But as in this latter case the question is, Is the soul joined to, does it perceive, the unextended body? so in the former the question must be, Do we or do we not (in the sense laid down) think the Infinite?

† The contradiction, *as it stands*, is the sheer product of pantheism, which makes the Cause to create by necessity of His nature, so that He only exists

evaded thus: "God is not at once," we might say, "both Absolute and Cause; but *first* He was absolute, and then He became cause." Here, however, we clash with the third conception, that of Infinite. How can an Infinite Being become cause? The Infinite must be all that exists or can exist, or how can it be infinite? Is aught conceivable which the Infinite is not?—how is it, then, the Infinite? Is the Infinite exhaustive of reality?—what room, then, for the finite? Thus we can only think the Deity infinite by denying Him as cause, only think Him as cause by denying Him as infinite. I gather also from Sir William Hamilton that the Absolute and Infinite, while they are thus in antagonism with the conception of cause, are again in mutual antagonism; for the Infinite denotes somewhat unfinishable, but the Absolute somewhat complete, finished (*absolutum*).<sup>\*</sup> The primary conceptions of the Deity being thus in mutual antagonism, what wonder (it is persisted) if the flaw which lies at the root be reproduced in the trunk and branches, and if the whole science of scholastic theology prove a mere tissue of knotty contradictions? Absolute and yet cause, Infinite and yet cause, Infinite and yet Absolute; necessary and yet free; many and yet one; simple yet omnipresent; He endures without time; He is intelligent without consciousness,† immense without magnitude—But enough; such contradictions are quite familiar to the philosopher and to the divine. For what, in all ages, has mainly contributed to the generation of theories in metaphysics and theology? What has swollen up those gigantic volumes of the schoolmen? What has suggested discussions and sharp disputations innumerable? What is the very effort to speculate but the attempt to escape, postpone, transcend contradictions, to advance the domain of reason, and diminish the sum of our philosophical ignorances?

Are these contradictions which abound in speculative science a proof that it is a mere sport of the reason, which amuses itself with shadows or builds up castles of words? or are they only a proof, of what has never been denied, that transcendental science, and especially speculative theology, must at best be meagre, inadequate, and imperfect on account of the immense disproportion between the mind and the objects which it aspires to know and reason about? The school of Kant maintains the former alternative,—that the Absolute

as effectuating the universe; while, in the Catholic doctrine, He is only cause because He chooses by no necessity of His nature.

<sup>\*</sup> Sir William Hamilton, *Discussions*.

† We cannot predicate *our* kind of consciousness of the Almighty, yet it is of course the only kind by us comprehensible.

Being, which is the object of the sciences of ontology and natural theology, is not only incomprehensible, but altogether unintelligible; not merely mysterious, but unthinkable. But we must not forget the principles on which this conclusion must stand or fall. St. Augustine, many hundred years ago, furnished a list of paradoxes which beset the attempt to comprehend the Incomprehensible; yet he rejoiced to know Him whom the mind of man dare not measure as the cause of those wondrous creatures which surround us. But the school of Kant, in opposition to the witness of consciousness, has made the law of causation a mere mental form,—not essentially true, that is, not true in itself, but only true to us and true of the present order of things,—and, as a legitimate consequence, has denied its transcendental application. St. Augustine, again, saw in our necessary conceptions of that which must be true in itself apart from individual instances, of that which must be right and just in itself apart from individual cases and circumstances, and of that which must be beautiful in itself apart from individual associations and comparisons, evidences, nay attributes, of the absolutely good, the true, and the fair; but all this is now regarded as a delusion, dismissed as a dream, though a brave dream of enthusiastic genius, and that by men who, like Kant and Sir William Hamilton, have admitted the fact of an irresistible instinct in its favour deep-rooted in human nature. It is not easy, it must be owned, to answer the objections of these philosophers in a manner which would satisfy themselves; for their demands are exorbitant. If they require the advocates of a scientific theology to exhibit a systematic account of the Sovereign Being which shall never, through the weaknesses of human thought, be convicted of self-contradiction, I do not hesitate to affirm that, whatever we may think of such individual instances of contradiction as those cited from Mr. Mansel, and although we may fairly dismiss some of them as contradictory in sound rather than in sense, still it would argue in us considerable presumption to accept their challenge. Far be from Christian philosophers the audacious spirit of such speculators as Scotus, Erigena, Giordano Bruno, and Hegel, who have theorised on the Divine Nature with impious confidence, and reduced Him who is the Mystery of mysteries to the poor level of human comprehension. But is there, then, no alternative between knowing nothing and knowing *as we are known*? I accept (not, indeed, as it has been recently explained) the inspired solution that “*we know in part*,” for “the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are

made; also His eternal power and divinity.”\* And since we only know in part, since our every conception of the God-head has its dark and bright side, it is easy for the opponents of rational theology to play off our ignorance against our knowledge, to involve us in paradoxes, to use the very imperfections of human words to our disadvantage, and, lastly, to argue plausibly, but surely not justly, that such conclusions of the reason as are in apparent antagonism must either be repudiated or the antagonism removed—still, in short, insisting that we must know all or nothing.

Having heard the decisions of modern philosophy, it will perhaps be both profitable and interesting to glance back upon the old world. The great fathers of the Christian Church, many of whom ranked as high in philosophy as in sanctity,—those grand and laborious geniuses, the subtle schoolmen of the middle ages, whose stupendous efforts in the search of truth large-minded men like Sir William Hamilton and Mr. Mansel know how to appreciate,—what thought they of the boundaries of knowledge? what of the contradictions which infest our rational imbecility? But the problem was not agitated and sifted in the ancient as it has been in the modern world. You will hardly find, perhaps, in the folios of the Christian fathers and schoolmen the question emphatically propounded, “What are the limits of human thought?” or the law distinctly enunciated, that paradox is the criterion of human ignorance. It was only natural that the construction of a philosophy of the Conditioned should be the enterprise distinctive of a sceptical epoch in speculation. Human reason, in the earlier stages of its career, would be tempted to dare all things, and, impatient of restraint, wait till the event had indicated what was within and what beyond the reach of its ambition; or, if there was any check, it could be only where speculation brought the philosopher into antagonism with the dogmas of Christianity. This we might have expected, and this was what really happened. It was after age had succeeded age, and the world had witnessed the same sort of difficulties constantly recurring, and the same unsatisfactory solutions revolving as by a fixed law; when school had been set up against school, and theory against theory; when men began to regard philosophers as the starters of ingenious questions which they could not themselves answer; and when, lastly, one appeared in the name of philosophy to pull down every thing while he built up nothing; †—it was then, that the herald of a new epoch ‡ began to philosophise, not so much on the objects of philosophy as

\* Rom. i. 20.

† Hume.

‡ Kant.

upon philosophy itself; and aspired to quell the storm—to bid “thus far” to the haughty waves of human speculation. But if the great masters of ancient philosophy furnished no theory on the limits of cognition, yet their writings contain ample suggestions towards that end; and it is to such suggestions, combined with the great help of the very school to which I find myself in necessary opposition, that I am indebted for the following system.

We must distinguish two sorts of knowledge in man: one which is engaged about the mere fact, another which is engaged about the theoretical explanation of existence. The Greek fathers called the former the knowledge *ὅτι ἐστί*, or *that* a thing is; and the latter *διότι ἐστί*, or the knowledge *how* or *why* it is. The distinction obtained among the schoolmen the terms “scientia quia” and “scientia prop-ter quid,” standing respectively for the *γνώσις ὅτι ἐστί* and *διότι ἐστί* of the fathers. Now originally the *ὅτι*, or “quia,” was a term identical in meaning with what is now called empirical knowledge; but its usage became subsequently extended so as to include facts of the transcendental order. Thus Scotus, for instance, tells us that of the Divine Being we have only the knowledge “quia,” because, “as is admitted on all hands, God is not otherwise cognisable by us.”\* The distinction cannot be conveniently rendered into English. Perhaps we may substitute the terms ‘apprehensive’ and ‘comprehensive’ for the knowledge *that*, and *how* or *why*, which would sound awkwardly in our tongue. But their difference once acknowledged, it will immediately appear that the boundary-line of these diverse sorts of cognition must be far from identical. We know that many things are, without knowing absolutely *how* any thing is, or *what* any thing is. We can, indeed, attain to a relative comprehension of things in this visible world;—we know what causes the rainbow; we know that bodies fall by the law of attraction; we know the laws which regulate our planetary system; and such relative knowledge of the nature of things in the physical order may be indefinitely extended, in proportion as experience furnishes us with fresh facts as the groundwork of our conclusions. But as our experience, after all, is limited, so the science of the nature of things is limited. At length a question is always possible to which there is no possible answer; such as the question of the absolute nature of a thing—what it is *in itself*. Here we are always in the dark. The absolute nature of God Himself is not more hidden from us than that of the meanest pebble; we are wholly ignorant of both. It must be further

\* Scotus, Opera, tom. iv. lib. i. q. 1, schol. vi. § 37.



observed that, as regards facts of the transcendental order, we have not even that relative comprehension which obtains as to facts of the physical order; for this relative comprehension is only possible by experience, and of the transcendental order, as the term implies, we have no experience. By experience we may discover that it is electricity which causes the thunder; but how material substance affects us with taste and smell we can never learn; the *how* it is done not being given in experience, but only the *fact* that it is done. There is consequently no *real* advancement possible upon the necessary conclusions which reason furnishes regarding the hyper-physical world. We may, indeed, analyse these conclusions, and thus obtain an apparent advance of our knowledge: thus if a Necessary Being exists, it follows that He is eternal and infinite; if He is the cause of the universe, it follows that He contains virtually the perfections which He causes; if He is simple, He is unextended: but this advancement is *only* apparent. We have in reality obtained no new knowledge, but merely analysed, unfolded that which had been already acquired; the notions of the Eternal and Infinite being virtually given in the notion of the necessary; the perfections of creation being, in like manner, virtually proclaimed of the Deity in the very fact of proclaiming Him their cause; and the notion of unextension being also implied in the notion of simplicity.\*

To these different relations of knowledge correspond two different sorts of self-contradiction, viz. contradictions which regard the *fact that a thing is*, and such as regard the *theory*, or *how it is*. Of contradictions, then, which regard the fact that a thing is, one or the other must be true, on the law of excluded middle, *e. g.* either the soul is compound or simple, either the world is finite or it is infinite; but of contradictions which regard the '*how*' of the fact, both may be held, as both may be true together. These latter the scholastics called contradictions *quoad nos*—contradictions to our ignorance. Thus the Almighty is at once both simple and omnipresent, which to our minds are so far contradictory attributes that we cannot conceive *how* they can possibly coexist in the same being; but if reason shows that this *must be so*, in spite of our inability to conceive it, what can oblige us to reject what it really tells us merely because it does not tell us more? True, it is a law of our intel-

\* It appears from this that in an *indirect* manner we have also "*scientia propter quid de Deo*;" thus His *aseitas* (as the schoolmen speak) is the *propter quid* of His infinitude. This Scotus remarks in a passage which I cannot recover.

lectual nature that imagination colours with an element of sense our most transcendental ideas (even while reason protests against it); and by this law *bigness* and *littleness*, strive as we may, attach respectively to immensity and simplicity, so that we lose simplicity in immensity, and immensity in simplicity. But here there is no direct contradiction; for it is not said that the Almighty is simple yet compounded, immense yet limited; but it is in the attempt to reconcile these attributes of immensity and simplicity together, which is nothing else than the attempt to comprehend the Divine Nature, that an indirect contradiction (to our ignorance) is manifested. In like manner there is nothing contradictory in the conceptions of Absolute, Cause, or Infinite, taken severally, and supposing such conceptions possible, as Mr. Mansel has admitted, but it is the attempt to reconcile them together which results in contradiction; and this may be admitted without involving consequences detrimental to the science of theology. It is a very old truth, that the understanding begins to utter falsehoods when it meddles in the relations of things with and within their *absolute essence*. "Unde," says the angelic doctor, "*circa quidditatem rei, per se loquendo intellectus non fallitur. Sed circa ea quæ circumstant rei essentiam vel quidditatem intellectus potest falli, dum unum ordinat ad aliud, vel componendo vel dividendo, vel etiam ratiocinando.*"\* Such apparent antilogies, then, which only arise when reason has passed its natural limits, are most salutary and instructive, and only fatal to transcendental science on the hypothesis of the Kantian conceptualism. Theories abound in all speculative science which aim at nothing short of the absolute solution of those dark problems which continual failure pronounces to be absolutely insoluble by human ingenuity; and the student wants some criteria to assist him in the recognition of such problems, lest he waste his time in the fruitless endeavour to comprehend the incomprehensible. A question, then, is unanswerable when (1) the attempt shows two or more sides which can be severally demonstrated, though either be in apparent antagonism with the other, so that (2) the very position of the one side seems equivalent to the negation of the equally demonstrable counter-position; and *vice versâ* (3) when the disputants on either side are mutually triumphant over each other, both being irresistible in attack and impotent in defence; (4) and when opposed errors, or (in theology) heresies,

\* Summa, 1, 2, q. 85, art. 6, and 1, q. 17, art. 3. "Unde circa quod quid est intellectus non decipitur; sicut neque sensus circa sensibilia propria. In componendo verò, vel dividendo potest decipi."

have been in all ages engendered from an over-bias towards one or another side in the attempted solution.\* But these criteria have in reality one common origin, and are reducible to one canon, as phenomena attendant on the effort to master the absolute 'how' or 'what' of things; and the simple reason for unfolding them at length is, that we are often unaware of the unsatisfactory character of the problem until the above-mentioned phenomena enforce it on the attention. It will be observed that the great intellectual contests which have been waged from the rise of speculation till the present time are rarely such as bear on questions of fact, but such as bear on the relationship of philosophical facts. Such controversies are very various; but perhaps they may be reduced to these four heads: (1) those which regard the relation of the necessary with the contingent; (2) those which regard the relation of mind with matter; (3) those which regard the relation of cause and effect; (4) those which regard the relations of attributes or qualities with their substance, and, what comes in the end to the same difficulty, the relations of the attributes or qualities with one another.

Two instances present themselves conspicuously under the first head of relations, and the first is the doctrine of creation. Now I assume, with St. Augustine† and St. Thomas,‡ that the fact of creation is asserted by the reason, being implied in the law of causation; but how can we conceive the *manner* of creation? When we say that the world was made out of nothing, do we mean that the nothingness was a *quasi* material out of which the solid universe was compounded? Reason protests against so gross an hypothesis. Did the Deity, then, evolve the universe out of Himself? Reason protests against the alternative. But what medium can we find between these two accounts,—the former gross and puerile, the latter absurd and blasphemous,—which may be esteemed the true account of creation? None is by us conceivable, and any attempt at a satisfactory conclusion must result in self-contradiction; for we must either regard nothing as a something out of which the world was made, or confound the necessary with the contingent by making the latter contained in the former in some (we know not what) germinal condition; we must, in short, either make the necessary contingent or the

\* These criteria of insoluble problems are borrowed in substance from Kant's *Critique*.

† "In principio fecisti cœlum et terram. Scripsit hoc Moyses et abiit . . . Quod si et hoc scirem, num ab illo scirem? Intus utique mihi intus in domicilio cogitationis, nec Hebræa, nec Græca, nec Latina veritas, sine oris et linguæ organis, sine strepitu syllabarum diceret, Verum Dicit." Conf. xi. 3.

‡ Summa, 1, q. 45, art. 2.

contingent necessary.\* But should this ignorance of the manner of creation make us discredit our reason, which declares the fact that finite mutable beings "cry aloud"† that they must have a cause, and ultimately, for that is implied, an Absolute Cause? I may take, as another instance, the impossibility (as very many will consider it) of reconciling causation with freedom. But to avoid here all possibility of misconception, I premise that both these doctrines are wholly and evidently true; nor can any one, without being prepared to go fearful lengths, abate one jot of the full meaning of either. Both are emphatically witnessed by consciousness. The law of causation is a necessary truth, which none can deny without impugning the light of reason; the freedom of choosing is a contingent fact, but almost every action men perform witnesses to their conviction that *it is a fact*. We know, therefore, *that* these two truths, as coexisting, must be somehow or other reconcilable; but *how* they are actually reconciled we do not know, and we might accommodate to this difficulty the language of St. Augustine about the analogous difficulty in theological science, that while asserting the necessity of causation, we seem to impugn the freedom of the will; while asserting the freedom of the will, we seem to impugn the necessity of causation. When we say that whatsoever happens must have a cause, do we exempt the *act of choosing* from this rule, or do we not? Do we say that such an act, like every thing else which happens, is determined by a cause—how, then, is it a free act? Do we say that such an act is undetermined by any such cause, and that it determines itself—how now reconcile this statement of the case with the *necessity* of causation, for a single exception must ruin such necessity? To escape this dilemma, many philosophers, both in the middle ages and in modern times, have framed theories in which an influence is exerted on the will according to the ordinary physical laws, while it was still attempted to show how liberty is consistent with such an influence;‡ but of all such systems it must be acknowledged that they have either defended freedom at the expense of causation, or causation at the expense of freedom; and this while the defenders of freedom have fully admitted that causation which they inadequately explained, and the defenders of causation have fully allowed the freedom which was apparently damaged by their theories. The same ques-

\* This, the contradiction of pantheism, is a direct contradiction.

† "Clamant quod facta sint." St. Augustine, Confessions, book xi, ch. 4.

‡ The difficulty is postponed, not removed, by asserting a moral in the place of a physical influence, as some have done.

tion, *mutatis mutandis*, has been discussed in theology, with just as little chance of being brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

As regards problems of the second class, which turn upon the mysterious relations of mind and matter, I may instance those famous theories of divine assistance—occasional causes, preëstablished harmony, plastic medium, and physical influence—which have been devised to account for the communion of the material with the spiritual world, but which, however, the second and third theories explain away altogether, denying the real action of matter upon mind, and mind upon matter; the fourth is as difficult as the difficulty it was intended to remove; while the first and last are only more tolerable because they assert the fact without attacking the real mystery, which is left in its original obscurity.\* The same phenomena are presented in this as in the foregoing problems; for as it is concerned about a relationship which can never be adequately explained, it happens again that, according to their individual bias, philosophers are led to sacrifice one or the other of the facts related; some attributing too much to mind at the expense of matter, others allowing too much to matter at the expense of mind; so that idealism and egoism, sensationalism and materialism, are on either side the respective results. And this, as Reid well observes, is due to the fact, that philosophers have not been content with the knowledge that they see, hear, and taste, but have wished further to rob nature of her secret as to *how* this is accomplished. And here a great inconsistency in the position of Sir W. Hamilton crops out. The ground on which he rejects the science of rational theology, and on which he pronounces the Deity unintelligible, is precisely that of the contradictions which such a science, such an intellectual apprehension, must immediately betray; but the doctrine of the immediate communion of mind and matter, and its corollary of immediate perception, are open to the same objection, and yet have the approbation of Sir William Hamilton. "Material objects are without the mind," argued the idealist,† "and therefore there can be no union between the object and the percipient; they are disproportioned to the mind, and removed from it by the whole diameter of being." "It appears to me quite certain," says Malebranche, "that the will of spirits is incapable of moving the smallest body in the world; for it is evident that there

\* I have not identified, as Sir W. Hamilton does, the theory of divine assistance with that of occasional causes; for Descartes *admitted* and Malebranche *denied* the real intercommunion of mind and matter.

† Norris, cited by Reid, *Intellectual Powers*, essay ii. ch. 4.

is no necessary connection between the will we have to move our arm, for instance, and the movement of our arm. . . . But not only are not men the true causes of the movements which they produce in their bodies ; it seems to me that it is a *contradiction* that they can be so. A true cause is a cause between which and its effect the mind perceives a necessary connection ;”\* and, lastly, Laromiguiere thus comments upon the system of physical influence : “ This system is simple, but it affords us no help in explaining the mysterious union of an extended and an unextended substance.

‘Tangere enim et tangi nisi corpus nulla potest res.’†

Nothing can touch or be touched but what is extended ; and if the soul be unextended, it can have no connection by touch with the body ; and the physical influence is inconceivable or contradictory.”‡ In spite of these objections—which (because they address themselves to my ignorance) I cannot answer—against the immediate union of soul and body, and against the immediate apprehension by the mind of sensible objects, I accept these doctrines, the truth of which is witnessed by consciousness ; but how Sir William Hamilton brought himself to admit an immediate apprehension of sensible things *in spite* of its seeming contradiction, and to reject an intellectual apprehension of the Deity *because* of its seeming contradiction, I cannot tell. If he says “ the finite cannot think the infinite,” I answer that the unextended cannot think the extended ; if he object that to know God we must *be* God, I answer that, on the same reasoning, to know matter we must be matter ; if he insist that the attributes of the Deity, as thought by us, can be convicted of contradiction, I answer that the properties of matter itself can be convicted of the same opposition ; nor, lastly, can he bring more authorities against the intellectual apprehension of God than I can bring against the intellectual apprehension of matter itself.

The same difficulties which attach to the relations of mind and matter attach also to the relation of cause and effect in general. We know that whatever happens must have a cause ; that an effect is only effect inasmuch as it has a cause, and that a cause is only cause as producing an effect ; but *how*, absolutely speaking, the cause can produce the effect,—what is the connecting-link between these,—of this we have not the smallest notion. We can frame no theory as to how any thing acts upon another which would not be speedily con-

\* Malebranche, *De la Méth.* livre sixième, part. ii.

† Lucretius.

‡ Quoted by Sir W. Hamilton, *Lectures*, vol. i. p. 306.

victed of contradiction ; and hence Malebranche and Leibnitz were led into the denial of the action and reaction of finite substances upon each other ; to the one the universe presented a system of occasions, to the other a system of harmony ; but to neither a system of causation.

How attributes, which are contrasted, can exist in the same subject, is another ignorance, beset on all sides with contradictions. We know, for instance, that matter is extended, and that it is compounded ; but no sooner do philosophers attempt to comprehend the nature of matter as extended and compounded than these attributes are made to contradict one another.\* Thus, if matter is extended, it is divisible ; as still extended, it is still divisible ; and so on to infinity. On the other hand, if matter is compounded, it must be ultimately resolvable into a definite number of simple elements ; for as the plural supposes the singulars which go to make it up, so the compound supposes the simple. Matter as extended, then, is infinitely divisible ; as compounded, it is made up of simple indivisible elements. But the reader may set aside the former argument in favour of the latter. “An infinite number is a contradiction direct and in terms,” he will say ; “and an infinite number of extended parts would make matter of infinite bulk, however small those parts might be. On this reasoning, a grain of sand and the whole earth must be equally great and equally small, both being compounded of an infinite number of extended parts. Besides, what we divide *ad infinitum* is not *real extension*, but a mere conception of our mind ; what, on the other side, can be more just and conclusive than the argument, ‘that the compound supposes the simple’ ?” Be it so ; I admit that matter can in no sense be infinite ; but is it not, again, a contradiction to suppose that extension is made up of unextended atoms ?

The attributes of mind fare no better than those of matter, being also to our ignorance mutually irreconcilable. The soul is perfectly one and simple, yet it wills, reasons, and remembers. Willing is quite unlike reasoning, reasoning quite unlike remembering, remembering quite unlike both. How can three distinct and dissimilar powers meet in one simple and individual soul ? The antilogies of the soul have, moreover, this remarkable feature, that we are, for the most part, immediately conscious of both the seeming contradictories, and consequently that they must agree together, while we are utterly helpless as to the manner of their reconciliation. I am conscious that I will, reason, remember—that I am manifold ; conscious, again, that it is *I*, the same individual unit,

\* The second of Kant’s Antilogies.

who will, reason, remember—that I am one. I am conscious, again, that I *now* will who was remembering, *now* reason who was willing—I change; conscious also that I who now remember or reason am the identical self who was willing—I do not change. The simplicity of the soul is also in direct apparent antagonism with the Aristotelian doctrine of its corporeal ubiquity, *i. e.* its being wholly in the whole and wholly in each part of the body. It is the same undivided self (of this we are conscious) which thinks in the brain, feels in the fingers, sees with the eyes, and tastes with the tongue; and not one part of me which feels, another part which sees, and another which tastes:—I am not thus divided against myself. But how the soul can be all over the body without size, and again wholly in the whole, is a mystery analogous with the coexistence of immensity and simplicity in the Creator. In all this there is no *direct* but only an indirect contradiction—no asserting and denying the same thing at the same time and in the same respect. The human soul declares itself, in consciousness, manifold and yet one; but the plurality is asserted of the consciousness, the unity of that which is conscious: it declares itself mutable and yet identical; but, again, the mutability is asserted of the consciousness, the identity of that which is conscious: it declares itself undivided yet in all parts of the body, but it declares itself to be undividedly in all parts. The contradiction we make for ourselves when, leaving the fact, we try to devise a *theory* as to how these many attributes can meet in one—how this one can become many. Vain attempt! that central unity in which the attributes mingle and are identified is substance; but of substance we only know that it is, not what it is: “*Quis enim me doceat, quid sit substantia, nisi illis miseris verbis—res subsistens?*”\*

It must be owned that with contradictions such as these the ideal of God elaborated by human reason is replete. We can prove the existence of a Necessary Being, and hence argue by merely analytical judgments that He is one, simple, eternal, immense, infinite, almighty, all-wise, all-perfect, the climax and fullness of reality, for all such attributes are virtually contained in the very notion of a Necessary Being. It is in answering the *why*, *how*, and absolutely *what* of the Divine Nature that we are made to feel our blindness and ignorance. Reason tells us that there must be a Sovereign Being or nothingness; but should we ask, “Why the Sovereign Being and why not nothingness?” reason is silent. The law of

\* Julius Cæsar Scaliger. Quoted by Sir W. Hamilton, *Discussions*, App. I. (B).



causation as true *in itself* carries us beyond the present order of things and the constitution of our faculties; it supposes, from the very necessity of the case, an independent being on which all things depend—a self-existent being by which all things exist. But should we ask, “How can a being exist of itself?” reason has no answer. A self-existent being is a contradiction to our minds; but reason does not contradict itself in asserting the necessity of such a being, however incapable we be of comprehending him; nor, again, is such a conception of a self-existent being wholly contradictory so as to prohibit thought: we know what we mean, we know not how it can be. The schoolmen expressed this when they declared the “*Demonstratio de Deo*” to be “*an sit*,” not “*quid sit*.” But if each attribute taken singly has its bright and dark side, thus verifying the dictum that “we know in part,” much more is this found true of the several attributes when collated. The reasoning is analytical; and so long as we merely develop the several attributes from their source in the idea of a self-existent, we encounter no serious opposition; but the want of more than partial conceptions causes gaps in our knowledge which we would fain bridge over by synthesis, while this, from the nature of the case, can never be fully accomplished; we only postpone contradictions which return upon us again with renewed force; we recur to illustrations drawn from the world of sense, but these rather aid the imagination than assist the reason: they help us to believe that the thing *is so*, but not to conceive *how it is so*; and often they merely reconcile us to our ignorance. “What art thou, then, my God?” says St. Augustine,—“what but the Lord God. . . Highest, best, most potent, omnipotent; most merciful, yet most just; most hidden, yet most strong; steadfast, yet incomprehensible; unchangeable, yet all-changing; never new, never old; all-renewing, and bringing old age on the proud while they know it not; ever working, ever at rest; still gathering, yet nothing lacking; supporting, filling, over-spreading; creating, nourishing, and maturing; seeking, yet having all things. Thou lovest without passion; art jealous without anxiety; repentest, yet grieveest not; art calm in Thine indignation. Thou changest Thy works, Thy purpose unchanged; receivest again what Thou findest, yet didst never lose; never in need, yet rejoicing in gains; never covetous, yet exacting interest.”\*

It remains now to contrast the doctrine advocated in these pages with that of Kant and his recent disciples. This, then, I conceive to be the fundamental error of the Kantian philo-

\* Confessions, book i. ch. iv.

sophy, that it limits reason itself, instead of merely limiting *reasoning*. But the axioms of reason cannot be limited by the nature of the rational creature, nor their application confined to this visible universe which is his habitation; they are necessary axioms, and to limit is to ignore this necessity. That which is only true to the mind of man, and in the existing order of things, is not necessarily true: that which is the mere expression of a mental imbecility is not necessarily true. But necessary truth is that which *is true* in itself, and consequently applicable in every order of things; that which we cannot annihilate in thought, and would survive the extinction of our minds and our mental imbecilities. Thus endowed with principles true in themselves, the mind of man rises to the full dignity of an immortal spirit; and soaring above these clouds of seeming contradiction, apprehends what it vainly strives to comprehend; and the deceitfulness of our understanding is corrected and compensated by the impèrious necessity of our reasonings. We cannot conceive how (so as to escape contradiction) the Almighty exists of Himself, or how such and such attributes agree together; yet reason convinces us that there must be a Necessary Being, and that He has such and such attributes. We cannot conceive without self-contradiction the manner of creation out of nothing; yet reason insists on the necessity of creation out of nothing as implied in the principle of causation. We cannot conceive without self-contradiction how a purely simple substance can agree with many and distinct attributes; yet reason insists that God is a simple substance and has many distinct attributes; and again reason insists, in a voice which compels assent and dispels assent to all delusion, that in all this the contradiction only *seems*, that in reality contradiction cannot be, and that the blasphemy of Hegel is the delirium of philosophy. But such a refuge from contradiction,—is it possible in the philosophy of Kant? Unless we admit a faculty in man which reaches *that which is* through the mists and fogs of *that which seems*, ought not the contradiction itself to be the reality—the only reality for us? This was the decision of the angelic doctor about the Kantianism of his day—for only the name is new: “Quidam posuerunt quod vires quæ sunt in nobis cognoscitivæ nihil cognoscunt nisi propriam passionem; puta quod sensus non sentit nisi passionem organi: et secundum hoc intellectus nihil intelligit nisi suam passionem, scilicet speciem intelligibilem in se receptam. Sed hæc opinio manifeste apparet falsa. . . . quia sequeretur opinio antiquorum dicentium omne quod videtur esse verum, et similiter quod contradictoriæ essent simul veræ. Si enim potentia non cognoscat

nisi propriam passionem de ea solum judicat.”\* Limit the axioms of reason, allow them only a subjective significancy and an application within the order of experience, and it is no longer absurd to say that, beyond the sphere of our thought and in another order of being, things may happen without causes,—two and two make five, mendacity and theft be virtues, or the mania of Hegel become right reason, and pure Being identical with pure Nothing.

To limit reason in its own nature is, therefore, to impugn the light of reason, which is only ours *to use*, and is not consequently limited by the limits of our understanding, but the conditions of its application—our *reasoning* must of necessity be limited by the deficiency or insufficiency of the data we reason upon; and this, I think, would be the common-sense answer to the question, “*What are the limits of our thought?*” which resolves itself into this, “What is the rule and what are cases of insufficient data for thought or reason?” in which latter shape the question has, I trust, been sufficiently answered above. A solution which accepts philosophy while it accounts for the aberrations of philosophers, and pays due homage to reason while it checks the extravagancies of theory, has at least the merit of moderation. It is hard to think that while the Almighty has set in the heart of man an instinct to philosophise, philosophy should have been from first to last a sublime mistake; but, on the other hand, it were folly to ignore what has always been and what is now the actual condition of speculative science. Philosophy is right and reason is right in the hyperphysical as in the physical order; but *theory*, or rather theory usurping the dignity and authority of dogma, has been the bane and scandal of metaphysics. Be it remembered that I use the word ‘theory’ here in a restricted sense (and for want of a better) to designate such expedients and devices as the mind contrives,—for the purpose of filling up, as I said, or bridging over those dark and gloomy chasms of our philosophical ignorances. Not content with a mere system, the philosopher has aimed at an absolute theory of knowing and being, in which every thing should find its place, no fact remain unexplained, and all things be bound up in one harmonious and intelligible unity; nor can it be denied that such an aspiration has its warrant in a sublime instinct of our nature, and is an earnest that what is impossible to us in the present will be accomplished in a future state of being, when we shall no longer know in part, but as we are known. Within its own order, then, and within certain limits, theory is natural, desirable, and

\* 1, 2, q. 85, art. 2.

entitled to an honourable position in philosophy ; but its besetting sin is to ambition the chair of dogma. Questions like the following, with the theories they have suggested, need never be banished from speculation : How can one substance act upon another—matter upon matter, mind upon matter, matter upon mind ? How can simple elements make solid, extended, stable matter ? How is the soul joined to the body ? How can the unextended think the extended ? How is freedom consistent with causation ? or, if you will, How could a world begin in a void time, or be located in a void space ? or, How could the Deity have created the world we see ? or (blackest ignorance of all !), How comes it there is a Deity, and why not rather the reign of formless, empty nothingness ? The spirit must beat itself against the barriers of its earthly cage and learn the limits of its prison-house. Had no man ever asked such questions, they would yet remain to be asked ; had no man propounded such theories as mediate ideas, pre-established harmony, occasional causes, plastic medium, animal spirits, they would be yet to be propounded ; and had not the impiety of unhumble theorists rendered it superfluous, it would be yet to point out how, while the *fact* of creation is given in science, the only *manner* of creation by us comprehensible is one inconsistent with the fact—the spurious creation of pantheism by self-development of the creating principle ; and that if, in short, we must have a philosophy in which the spheres of our apprehensive and comprehensive knowledge being coextensive, we shall understand all that we know,—such a philosophy must be that of Hegel, which out of pure *nothing* evolves Deity, universe, every thing ! It is natural, it is lawful, and quite consistent with that spirit of humility which should ever be the guide in our philosophical researches, to ask all questions and attempt every solution ; but it is unreasonable, it is often blasphemous, to regard our answers as dogmas, our theory of the reality as convertible with the reality itself. Theory aspires to complete and harmonise our knowledge,—to shift back, at least, if it cannot remove the contradiction,—to give a possible explanation of the thing so far as it is capable of explanation ; but after all, as it is only the product of reason employed upon materials furnished by the imagination, a *mere* theory of being, a philosophy of the *how* of things would be little better than a philosophical romance. Wishing to comprehend, for instance, how matter acts upon mind, and observing how, in the physical world, two substances which have no chemical affinity may be made to combine by means of some third which has affinity with both, the philosopher *imagines* (he cannot prove) that this manner of

combination obtains in the metaphysical order, and hence the theories of plastic medium, animal spirits, mediate ideas, &c.; or, again, observing how, in this world of ours, things are produced by a process of development,—as the chick from the egg, the plant from the seed, &c.,—he imagines that this rule obtains in the transcendental order, and the pantheistical theory of creation is the result. Such theories have been taught as dogmas, whereas they show at most that the only intercourse of mind and matter we can comprehend (and that inconsistent with the testimony of consciousness) is a mediate intercourse; that the only manner of creation we can comprehend (and that inconsistent with reason) is the creation of pantheists. But if the over-estimation of theory is one mistake, another surely is its disparagement within its proper province. True, its materials are furnished by imagination; yet has that faculty which assisted Leibnitz in mathematical, and Newton in physical science,—has it only no place in metaphysics? We cannot, indeed, prove, we can only suppose, that an order of things which obtains in the visible will also obtain in the invisible world; but when nothing in experience and nothing in reason directly discredits this supposition, when it is in harmony with all we know, may it not become more than a supposition—a justifiable presumption, which we may seize upon, to free ourselves, at least in some measure, from these hampering contradictions; a guess at least in the right direction; an anticipation which will be partially if not wholly verified in the world to come? It is this view of the case which to my mind makes the real value of theory and justifies its location *in science*, if it be not itself a part of science, but rather a sort of supplement, or comment, which hazards explanations of seeming inconsistencies.

The above-stated adjustment of the respective claims of dogmatism and scepticism, if accepted, gives us a clue to the solution of Kant's Antilogies, and a rule for our conduct in speculative controversy. I may, by unfolding the notion of the contingent, demonstrate the natural finitude of the universe as to duration and extension; but I cannot answer such objections as "How could the world begin in a void time, or be located in a void space?" nor would I venture to attempt an answer, lest some advantage should accrue to my opponent through my ignorance. I may disprove the arguments in favour of the infinite divisibility of matter, and approve the enthymeme of Leibnitz in favour of monads; but I must not meet the objection, "How can extension, solidity, stability result from simple unextended atoms?" I may appeal to the plain testimony of consciousness in favour of free-will, but I

must decline to answer the objection, "How is free-will reconcilable with causation?" I may prove from the principle of causation—restoring it its full significancy—that there is a Necessary Being, One who exists of His own nature, and who must consequently have absolutely originated or created that which not existing of itself has only being through efficiency of *the cause*; but I will not answer the objections as to the *manner* of creation which are usually put. Nor has my adversary any right to argue any thing in his favour from my silence on these different heads. The very statement that we know only *in part* supposes that some sort of objections (and I have shown what sort) are unanswerable; and no fair and honourable opponent ought, or should be suffered, to use our ignorance to the discredit of our knowledge. But if, as the whole drift of Sir W. Hamilton's philosophy goes to establish, we must either know all or nothing of the supersensual order, then indeed sceptic and dogmatist are silenced for ever; there is an end of philosophy, and we may burn our books, or only open them to convince ourselves how completely man has befooled himself with the light that was given for his guidance. May I hope to have shown, on the other hand, that man has been the dupe of his imagination, but never of his reason?

M.

## THE CHURCH IN THE ANCIENT SYMBOLS.—No. II.

IN my former paper I showed that the Church was symbolically represented by the early Christians under the image of a ship; and here a question of the greatest interest presents itself for discussion. A symbol, as has been frequently said, to be a symbol, must have something about it which shall have a tendency to produce in the mind of the beholder some striking or leading idea connected with the object it is intended to represent. It now remains for us to determine what leading idea is possessed in common by a ship and by the Church, as it was conceived by the early faithful. A glance at the monuments we have described will help to throw light upon this important point. For among them we shall find two distinct classes: one of ships, considered simply as such; the other of ships which are shown by the objects that accompany them to be representations of the bark of Peter. The jasper of Monsignore Borgia (18), the gem edited by Ficoroni (17), the cornelian of the Kircherian Museum (20), and many others, may be cited as specimens of the first class; to the second are to be referred the onyx (16) illustrated by

Aleander, the lamp-ship (24) of the Florence Gallery, and the Vatican ivory (23) edited by Buonarotti. To this double class of monuments corresponds an analogous double class of passages in the works of the Fathers. As the monuments of the first class exhibit the ship in general as a symbol of the Church, so the first class of patristic passages applies to the Church qualities and attributes which every ship, as such, possesses; and as the monuments of the second class present not any or every ship, but the ship of Peter, as the figure of the Church, so, in the second class of passages, the Church is described in language which identifies it with the same apostolic bark. We have examples of the former in the passages before quoted from Pseudo-Clemens, St. Hippolytus, Tertullian, and St. Augustine; and of the latter in the words of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Maximus of Turin, as will be more fully shown hereafter. The natural conclusion from these facts appears to be, that whilst the Church has many points in common with every ship as such, there exist in addition special reasons why it should be compared to the bark of Peter. The question to which I am addressing myself has, therefore, two parts: the object of the first is, to determine in what respect the Church is like a ship; and, this being once established, to examine, in the second place, why it should be called the ship of Peter. The leading idea common to the Church and to every ship is this,—as a gallant ship, owing to the strength of its timbers and the skill of its pilot and crew, carries its passengers in safety through many a tempest, so does the Church, rendered invincible by its heaven-given power and by the divine protection, bear the faithful through all the storms of the world to the port of eternal life. This is the leading feature which the symbol of the ship naturally impresses on the mind, this the striking idea commonly brought out and dwelt upon in the texts of the Fathers. But over and above all this, the Church is the bark of Peter, because, as St. Ambrose has it, “the Lord is not to be found on board every ship, but only on board the one in which the Apostles sail or Peter fishes,” that is, as he explains it, “teaches;” because, as St. Maximus declares, “the ship of the Church is the one which Peter is commanded to pull out into the deep, and from which he is to let down his nets to catch fish, that is, to unite men by faith;” because, as the same Father declares, “The Lord ascends only into that ship of the Church in which Peter is constituted master, since He has said, ‘upon this rock I will build my Church;’” because, as he says again,\* Peter had “such merit in the eyes of his Lord,

\* Hom. iii. de St. Petro et Paulo, p. 225.

that, instead of the care of a little craft, the government of the whole Church was intrusted to him; because, in one comprehensive word, the Church is the Church of Peter—*Ecclesia Petri*.\*

Let us now endeavour to gather from all that has been said some idea of what the early Christians believed the Church to be. According to them, the Church is like a ship on a stormy sea, buffeted by the winds and waves of the world, but victorious over both and invulnerable. She is a ship whose master and owner is God the Father, whose pilot is Christ, and whose sails are filled with a favourable breeze by the power of the Holy Ghost. She carries with her a vast multitude of passengers, gathered together from every corner of the earth; for she is catholic and universal. But although she is made the sport of the tempest, there is no confusion on board, no disorder; for a regularly-constituted hierarchy of ministers have her in their charge. The Bishop is at the prow, to watch the coming storm, and provide against the danger it threatens; the priests and deacons and inferior clergy have each their appointed stations and office. Many, indeed, and varied are the dangers that beset her path,—dangers from seducers and false prophets, dangers from those who doubt of the truth, dangers from hypocrisy and sin. But she perisheth not; for she bears aloft the saving cross of her Lord; she is held together by the charity of Christ, she is guarded by the holy angels. She is the bark of Peter; and although her Lord may appear to slumber awhile, still will He awake to save her. In her alone Christ teaches; outside of her there is no true faith. To have the faith, men must be drawn into her from the depths of the world; and the fisherman appointed to this work by Heaven is Peter. She is the ship of Christ, and the ship of Peter; the Church of Christ, and the Church of Peter. From all which we can easily deduce the notes of the Church. As the ship is one, so is the Church one. When Horace wished to describe symbolically the Roman empire, he found no symbol more apt to express its unity and its nature than that of a ship. She is holy, because directed by Christ and led on by the Holy Spirit; she is catholic, because all have a place in her; she is apostolical, because propelled by apostolic hands, and committed to the charge of the Prince of the Apostles.

Hitherto I have considered the symbolical monuments as if they exhibited only a single figure, and were designed to convey only a single idea. But, as will be seen from the description above given, the ship, in many of them, is found

\* St. Maximus, Ser. de divers.; ser. lxxxix. de Mirab. p. 639.



in combination with other symbols, especially with the *ixorx* and the dove. Likewise the relations between the ship of the Church and St. Peter are expressed with such peculiar significance as to call for our special attention. I now proceed to consider these combined symbols; but before doing so, it is necessary to make a remark. Not every combination of symbols in a monument is a sign that a hidden meaning is intended to be conveyed; but if we find the same combination recurring in many instances, and in the same evident connection, then we are warranted in concluding that the artist has had a design in grouping them together. Now in the monuments upon which we are engaged there are instances of this kind.

In the sepulchral titulus of Cassus Domninus (1), in the onyx (16), in the gem edited by Ficoroni (17), we have the ship combined with the *ixorx* in a very remarkable way. To these I am inclined to add the jasper of Borgia (18) and the ivory carving edited by Buonarrotti (23), both of which are marked with the name Jesus. For it is well known that the symbol of the *ixorx* principally means Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour, according to the explanation given by St. Optatus of Milevi\* and by St. Augustine.† Hence, perhaps, the two latter gems express, by the name they bear, the same idea of union between the ship of the Church and our Saviour as the former three by the presence of the mystic fish.

We shall be able to learn what this union means, by attending to some similar combinations of the *ixorx* with other symbols. For instance, in the monuments still existing of the union of the symbols of bread and the fish, we have the most complete key to the mystery contained in the union of the fish and the Church.

There are at least three tablets on which, according to Cav. De' Rossi, the bread and fish are united; but there is one composition which presents the most perfect parallel to the group on the onyx (16), and which on that score deserves an attentive study. I allude to one of the paintings recently discovered in the cemetery of St. Callistus. In the second chamber there is a representation of a living fish, swimming in the water, bearing on its back a large wicker basket. This basket is filled with loaves of that peculiar make and colour which belonged to what was known as sacred bread. Through an opening in the wicker-work is distinctly visible a red object like a glass vessel full of wine. This painting at once suggested to De' Rossi the words of St. Jerome,‡ "No riches

\* Lib. iii. Adr. Parmen.

† De Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. c. 23.

‡ Ep. ad. Rust. no. 20.

can equal his who bears with him the body of the Lord in a wicker basket, and His blood in a glass phial;” and the entire series of the other paintings of the chamber bear out his interpretation, that the union of the mystic fish with the bread and wine is a symbolical expression of our Lord’s real presence in the blessed Eucharist.\* Near the fish and bread is depicted the banquet at the Sea of Tiberias, which the Fathers declare to be a historical figure of the Eucharist; so that the figure and the sacred reality are thus brought into juxtaposition, and what is shadowed forth in the one is expressed as plainly as symbols will allow in the other. Now in each and every one of these particulars, the engraving on the onyx (16) is the exact counterpart of the painting in the Catacombs. In both is seen the living fish, which in each supports a certain object, in the one bread and wine, in the other the Church. In the one is described the banquet at the Sea of Tiberias, which is a figure of the reality expressed in the union of the fish with the bread and wine; in the other is described Christ walking on the waters and rescuing Peter from certain death, which, according to the Fathers, is a symbol of the care He has for His Church. Now have we not here a wonderful undesigned coincidence between the teaching and language of the Church of to-day and of the Church of the Catacombs? It is taught by theologians that the Eucharist is the real and true body, and the Church the mystic body of Christ; and here we find this language of the schools accurately expressed in symbols on the monuments of the very earliest ages of faith. How true it is that the Catholic Church, like Christ, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. To develop still more clearly and fully the extent of the meaning of this symbol, let us subject to a closer analysis the consequences of the doctrine that the Church is the body of Christ. That I may not be accused of heightening my description by borrowing the more glowing colours of later times, I will bring forward as the witness of antiquity the learned Origen, and confront him with one of the greatest of modern theological writers.† In the passage which I shall quote, he is defending against his pagan opponent the truth of the union of the Divine Word with a human soul. His argument is as follows: “We hold, after the Holy Scriptures, the entire Church of God to be the body of Christ animated by the Son of God, and the members of that body, as a whole, to be all those who have faith; for just as the soul gives life and motion to the body, which by its nature is not capable of any vital movement, so the Word acting on and moving in things necessary, His entire body,

\* De Christ. Monum. IXORN exhibentibus.

† Cont. Cels. vi. 48.

that is, the Church, moves in like manner each of the Church's members, so that without the Word they can do nothing." Compare with this passage the words of Moehler :\* "So Christ established a community; and His divine word, His living will, and the love emanating from Him exerted an internal binding power upon His followers; so that an inclination implanted by Him in the hearts of believers corresponded to His outward institution. And this, a living, well-connected, visible association of the faithful, sprang up, whereof it might be said, There they are, there is His Church, His institution, wherein He continueth to live, His spirit continueth to work, and the word uttered by Him eternally resounds. Thus the visible Church, from the point of view here taken, is the Son of God Himself, everlastingly manifesting Himself among men in a human form, perpetually renovated and eternally young—the permanent incarnation of the same as in Holy Writ even the faithful are called, 'the body of Christ.' Hence it is evident that the Church, though composed of men, is yet not purely human. Nay, as in Christ the divinity and the humanity are to be clearly distinguished, though both are bound in unity, so is He in undivided entirety perpetuated in the Church. The Church, His permanent manifestation, is at once divine and human; she is the union of both. He it is who, concealed under earthly and human form, works in the Church; and this is wherefore she has a divine and a human part in an undivided mode, so that the divine cannot be separated from the human, nor the human from the divine."

The other symbol combined very frequently with the Church is that of the dove, either with or without the olive-branch. The dove is without the olive-branch in the titulus of Flavia Secunda (3), in that of Serenilla (13), in the ship from the cloister of St. Lawrence (14), in the onyx (16); it appears with the olive-branch in the titulus of Genialis (4). According to the Cav. De' Rossi, the dove with the olive-branch certainly signifies peace. Without the olive-branch it may be taken in two senses, namely, as signifying either the Holy Ghost or the souls of the departed. The first signification is obvious to every one who reflects that the Holy Ghost appeared in that form at our Lord's baptism, as is related in the Gospel of St. Matthew. Paschasius Radbertus, in his commentary on that Gospel, has a sentence which seems to unite both senses: "The Holy Ghost appeared under the form of a dove, to show by it what those were one day to become who would arrive at the grace of the same Spirit."

\* Symbolism, ii. 6, Robertson's Translation.

If we say that the dove on the symbols of the ship signifies the Holy Ghost, a new and glorious privilege of the Church presents itself to our mind. As of old the Holy Ghost moved upon the face of the waters, infusing productive energy and order, so, according to this view, does the same Holy Spirit abide with the Church to guide and assist it. "The breeze that impels it," says St. Hippolytus, "is that Heavenly Spirit by which the faithful are sealed for God." On the other hand, should we prefer to believe that it signifies the souls of the departed, what must have been the faith of the early Christians in the greatness of the Church, when they thus gloried, even in death, in professing themselves its children? And when the olive-branch is added, it is insinuated that a life spent in the Church is the sure path to that heavenly peace in which the just shall sleep and rest in the self-same.

It now only remains to add a few remarks in illustration of the monuments which exhibit St. Peter in close connection with the Church; as, for example, the onyx (16), the cornelian of the Biblioteca Reale of Turin (19), the Vatican ivory (23), and the lamp-ship of the Florentine Gallery (19); the last-mentioned object is of especial importance, since it supplies us with a key to the interpretation of the rest. Antiquaries of one accord admit that the person at the helm is St. Peter, whose office of supreme governor of the Church is therein expressed. That this opinion is accurate, we are now in a position to prove. It has been shown that the ship is undoubtedly a figure of the Church; now, according to St. Maximus of Turin, St. Peter is the only one who had such merit in the eyes of his Lord, that instead of the care of a little craft, the government of the entire Church was intrusted to him. The same explanation may be given concerning the helmsman in all the other monuments above mentioned; and this enables us to add the finishing-stroke to the description of the Church we have derived from the early Christian symbols. For from this it follows that there exists the same relation between the Church and St. Peter as between the ship and the helmsman; that as the ship is guided and directed by the helmsman in the least movement it makes, so also the Church is guided and directed in all things by St. Peter. "Let us see," says the same St. Maximus,\* "what is this ship of Simon Peter, which of the two the Lord judged more suited for preaching, and which both protects our Saviour from injury and bestows upon mankind the lessons of faith; since we find that the Lord had already made a voyage in another vessel, in which He had


\* *Serm. de diversis*, *serm. lxxxix.*, de Mirab. p. 639.

been seriously injured. For He sailed with Moses in the Red Sea, when he led the people of Israel through the waves of the deep; but He was badly treated by them, as He Himself complains to the Jews in the Gospel, 'If you believed Moses, you would also believe Me.' Now the incredulity of the synagogue is an injury offered to our Saviour. For that reason does He choose the ship of Peter, and desert that of Moses; that is, He rejects the faithless synagogue, and takes to Himself the faithful Church. For there are two ships destined by God to fish men unto salvation in this world, as in the sea; as the Lord said to the Apostles, 'Come, I will make you fishers of men.' Of these two ships, one is left on the shore, empty and void; the other is brought out into the deep, laden and full: for the synagogue is left empty on the shore, because it had lost Christ with the oracles of the prophets; but the Church is brought out laden into the deep water, because it has received the Lord with the teaching of the Apostles. Therefore is it said to Peter, 'Pull out into the deep water;' that is, into the deep questions of the divine generation. For what is so profound as the address of Peter to the Lord, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God?' what so earthly as the words of the Jews concerning the same Lord, 'Is not this the son of Joseph the carpenter?' The former, with divine nobility of soul, proved Christ's nativity; the latter, with venomous mind, carnally estimated His heavenly generation. Wherefore unto Peter the Saviour says, 'Because flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but my Father who is in heaven;' but to the Pharisees He says, 'How can you, being evil, speak good words?' The Lord ascends only into that ship of the Church in which Peter is constituted master, since He has said, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church.' Which ship so swims in the deep waters of this world as to preserve uninjured in the general ruin all those whom it has on board. We have a figure of this in the Old Testament; for as the ark of Noah preserved safe amidst the general destruction all those who were carried in it, so also the Church of Peter will preserve unhurt in the general conflagration all those whom it contains. And as of old, when the Deluge was ended, the dove brought the token of peace to the ark of Noah, so likewise, when the judgment is ended, will Christ bear the joy of peace to the Church of Peter; for He is the dove, or peace, as He promised, saying, 'Once again shall I see you, and your heart shall be glad.'"

## Correspondence.

## THE SIGNS OF MARTYRDOM IN THE CATACOMBS.

SIR,—In your Number for January you inserted an article on the “Signs of Martyrdom in the Catacombs,” and in your March Number one of your readers, whose initials will cause *his* readers to recognise in him the great English authority on this matter, has signified his intention of publishing an article to controvert it. On this subject I am in a position to affirm that, ever since the Roman Catacombs were re-opened, towards the close of the 16th century, there has been a *catena* of most learned men who had but small confidence in the genuineness of the *corpi santi* extracted therefrom, because they doubted of the sufficiency of the evidence of the palm-branches engraved on the tomb, or of the so-called phials of blood which were usually found at the head of the graves, to prove the martyrdom of the tenant of the tomb. In 1855 there was printed at Brussels a work of considerable compass, entitled *De Phialis rubricatis, quibus Martyrum Romanorum sepulchra dignosci dicuntur observationes V.D.B.* Very few copies were printed, and the work has scarcely been communicated to any one. But a friend of mine at Rome has seen a copy, and he tells me that the volume, though little spoken about, has exerted a great influence. A short time ago a pamphlet of M. Ed. Leblant, a learned antiquarian of Paris, was brought to Rome; this was also directed against the phials of blood being considered as signs of martyrdom. The pamphlet is said to be very weak; but it has made an impression. My friend was present at a conversation where he heard one of the most learned members of the Commission of the Catacombs affirm that new regulations had been already made; that M. Leblant’s pamphlet had come a day after the fair; that for five years past a work of a very different calibre had been in existence, which had anticipated M. Leblant’s conclusions, &c.

I would also remark, that the writer of the “Signs of Martyrdom in the Catacombs” was quite mistaken in appealing to the authority of M. de Rossi in support of his views. M. de Rossi is well known at Rome to entertain exactly the contrary views. You have only to read what he says in his memoir upon the ΙΧΘΥΣ and upon the age of the monogram , which is found upon most of the tombs which possess a phial of blood, to know his sentiments about it. This being the case, I am sure that no Catholic can be so fearful of exploding a popular error as to object to Mr. J. S. N.’s developing his ideas in your pages. I hope he will do so boldly. After the decision that has been made at Rome, no scandal could possibly arise from demonstrating its reasonableness. And even if it were possible, our fathers used to say, *Utilius scandalum nasci permittitur quam veritas opprimatur.*

J. P.

## THE ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY OF LOUIS NAPOLEON.

SIR,—Acting on a hint at p. 413 of your Number for March, I have examined the writings of Napoleon III. to see if I could find there any clue to his ecclesiastical policy.

Among the works of Louis Napoleon, I only found one small fragment that treats professedly of ecclesiastical matters. It is a small essay, called "*Le Clergé et l'Etat*,"\* and it treats of education. The writer says that the clergy claim liberty of teaching, while the State claims the right to direct absolutely all public education. Each of these bodies would, he says, for its own interests, influence the rising generation, but each in a different, even a contradictory, way. Yet for all this he does not think it will be necessary to separate the Church from the State; for, though the clergy are unhappily opposed to the Revolution, to stop their pay would be, in fact, to shut out the poor from Church; and it is one of the aphorisms of Napoleon I. that "no one has the right to deprive the poor man, because he is poor, of that which might console his poverty." All the ceremonies of worship should be gratuitous for the people.

But the object of the statesman is to destroy, as much as possible, all spirit of caste, and to unite all citizens in one way of thinking, and into one line of interest. For this end he must find how to prevent the university being atheist, or the clergy ultramontane. The university will be reformed when the best men are chosen for professors, without any after-thought of pleasing at once the disciples of Loyola and the disciples of Voltaire; the clergy will be furnished with proper sentiments when there is no separate clerical education. This is the case in South Germany; and there the clergy are most learned, most tolerant, and most liberal.

Instead of being separated from the world from their childhood, and instead of imbibing in the seminaries a spirit hostile to the society in which they are to live, the German clergy are first taught to be citizens before they are priests. Hence it comes that they are so distinguished for their profound erudition, and for their ardent patriotism. In their eyes, to be a priest means to teach morality and charity, to make common cause with all sufferers, to preach justice and toleration, to foretell the coming reign of equality, to teach men that political redemption is a proper consequence of religious redemption.

If, then, the priests will give up their own separate education, Louis Napoleon (in 1843) promised that they should have the education of all other classes in their hands; and then, he says, citizens will become more religious the more the priests become citizens.

Since his accession to power he has done nothing to carry out this programme. On the contrary, when the Pope founded three new bishoprics in the French colonies, the President of the Republic took care to complete the work by obtaining the foundation of seminaries for them.

\* *Œuvres*, tom. ii. p. 31, ed. 1856.

His language has always been respectful to the clergy; on one occasion it has been even clerical. Sept. 25th, 1852, on laying the first stone of Marseilles Cathedral, he said, "In all places, in fact, where I can do so, I endeavour to maintain and propagate religious ideas, which are the most sublime of all, because they are our guide in prosperity and our consolation in adversity. My government—I say it with pride—is one of the only ones which have maintained religion for itself; which maintains it, not as a political instrument, not as a means of gaining a party, but solely from conviction, and for love of the virtue which it inspires and the truth which it teaches." Then he begged his hearers, whenever they entered the new temple, to remember in their prayers the sinner who laid its first stone. I do not know whether any of the bystanders thought of the proverb, "When the fox preaches, beware geese!"

He appeals to the loyalty of his deeds in reëstablishing the Papal government in 1849. But we must not forget the explanation of his motives that he gave at the time. In his message to the Legislative Assembly, 7th June 1849, the President of the Republic said, "With regard to the situation of the Pope, after Austria and Naples had decided to march upon Rome, and reëstablish the Papal authority pure and simple, we had the choice of three methods of acting. Either to oppose by force of arms all kinds of intervention, and thus we should have broken with all Catholic Europe simply for the benefit of the Roman republic, which we had not recognised; or to leave the three powers of the coalition to reëstablish the Papal power as they liked, without any modification; or to act independently for ourselves, and thus to make the Romans see that, amidst their dangers, France was their only refuge; for if France brought back Pius IX., he must, in all good faith, confirm the liberties he had promised; and, the French once in Rome, France would guarantee the integrity of the territory, and deprive Austria of all pretext for interfering in the Romagna. Moreover, the French flag thus fixed in Central Italy, might extend its protective shadow over the whole peninsula, none of whose sorrows are beheld without sympathy by France."

Probably the religious party hoped, and tried to think, that this language was more for the sake of making good his policy in the face of the parties that divided the Assembly than expressive of his own sentiments; but this hope received a rude blow by his letter to Edgar Ney, August 18th, 1849: "My *résumé* of the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope is, general amnesty, secularisation of the administration, *Code Napoléon*, and liberal government." However his later actions have disappointed our hopes, it is not fair to say that they contradict the language which we were too sanguine to comprehend.

As I do not find any more decided expressions of the religious policy of Louis Napoleon, I will turn to the book which I believe to be his Bible and his code,—the aphorisms of his uncle, collected by Liancourt.



First, then, what is religion? It is "the mystery of the social order."\* But it is a mystery of man's making, not of God's. "All religions are the offspring of men; and they are the true supports of virtue, of true principles, and of good manners" (p. 215). But there is no supernatural truth in any religion: one is as good as another. "A change of religion is inexcusable when made on personal grounds, but may be perhaps allowed because of the importance of its political consequences" (p. 217). "Every man ought to abide in the religion of his birth" (p. 219). Religion is not true, but only useful! "Religion was not meant for philosophers, they have no faith either in kings or priests. As to the faithful, it is impossible to give them, or to allow them to keep, too many miracles. If I had to make a religion for philosophers, it should be something quite contrary to that of believers" (p. 217).

With regard to the education of priests, he says: "The task of forming the young clergy should not be left to ignorance or fanaticism; we may say of priests what has been said of the tongue,—it is either the worst or the best of things" (p. 201). "The ignorance of the clergy is the greatest scourge of the world" (p. 204); and "The popes have done too many foolish things for me to believe them infallible" (p. 205).

With regard to their jurisdiction, he pronounced, October 27th, 1808, that the reason why the celibacy of the clergy was enforced was, "that family cares might not take them off from spiritual affairs, to which they ought to be exclusively devoted" (p. 207). "Priests ought to guide consciences, but ought not to exercise any exterior and bodily jurisdiction over the citizens" (p. 203). "The clergy should confine themselves to the government of heaven" (p. 135). "The decadence of Italy dates from the time when the priests wanted to govern the finances, the police, and the army" (p. 207). "Nothing degrades a nation so much as religious despotism" (p. 131).

With regard to the relation of Church and State, he says: "So far as police is concerned, all religion in a state ought to be entirely in the hands of the man who governs" (p. 85).

And with regard to the conduct of the governor towards religion, this is his advice: "Fanaticism must be put to sleep before one can root it out" (p. 141).

These are the maxims of a man who was nursed in the Revolution, and who saw religion at its lowest ebb; but who certainly, by more than one act of his life, deserved the thanks of Catholics, though I do not suppose he was much of a Catholic himself. Still Montholon wrote about him: "As a man Napoleon believed; as king, he considered religion to be a necessity, a powerful means of governing." If we did not otherwise know his splendid talents, his sayings about religion would give us a very low idea of his capacity; many irreligious men have had a much better practical understanding of it than he. He never seemed to think it was much more than an amusing or interesting ceremony,—a kind of gratuitous Sunday-

\* Liancourt, ed. Manning, Lond. 1848, p. 213.

morning opera. Bonald somewhere says of him, "He gave pictures to churches, revenues to bishops, and pensions to churchwardens ; and this he called the restoration of religion."

The uncle saw religion as it were crucified between two thieves ; the nephew lives in a period of revival, and has far other opportunities of knowing. But his immobility of intellect is unable to emancipate itself from the line which he has accepted as the *Napoleonic idea*.

R. S.

P.S. Since I found among the political aphorisms of Napoleon I. many that receive a great significance from the circumstances of the day, I will add them here.

First, as to the fate of conquered countries : "The chief good of nations is their independence, their political existence" (p. 13). "There is no condition more hideous than that of a people that is subject to another" (p. 71). The feeling of freedom goes so far that "no government which is under the protection of foreigners will ever be accepted by a free nation" (p. 41).

Yet for all this, he considered that this "first good" of nations was to be sacrificed without remorse for considerations of empire : "Peace based upon the independence of all nations is one of those Utopias which fools delight in, but which experience demolishes" (p. 51).

If the nation in its national capacity was free, he does not seem to have considered that each individual need ask for freedom also. They had enough if their lawful enjoyments were permitted. "True social happiness consists in the harmony and peaceful use of the enjoyments proper to each person" (p. 13). The true strength of nations he considered to reside in an institution that is quite opposed to social liberty : "The conscription is the root and marrow of a nation, the purification of its morals, and the true foundation of all its habits" (p. 17). "It is an eminently national institution when it has become a point of honour, for which each person feels jealous ; then the nation is great, glorious, and strong ; then it may defy misfortunes, invasions, and time" (p. 15).

The two following aphorisms will give an insight into his domestic ideas : "Divorce is a law in conformity with the interests of married people ;" and "The wife is made for the husband ; the husband for his country, his family, and for glory" (p. 139).

These two sentences are applicable to the present empire. The Emperor may be popular with the mob, because "a monarch ennobles plebeian merit, while an aristocracy snubs it" (p. 59) ; but he will be hated by the thoughtful classes, because "a prince crushes freedom when it stands in his way" (p. 55). Hence "courtiers and men of letters do not agree" (p. 117).

With regard to the conduct of government, he says : "To govern by a party, is to put oneself sooner or later into its power" (p. 39). "Half measures are always hurtful, and never conciliate an enemy" (p. 59). "In a revolutionary state there are but two classes, patriots

and suspects" (p. 33). "In making a constitution, one should never bind oneself by laws too much entering into detail. Constitutions are the work of time, and one can never leave too large a margin for improvements" (p. 41.) And the following sentence, which may suggest many an anxious misgiving about the success of the present *diplomatic* endeavours to prop up the temporal sovereignty of the Church, when we compare them with the organic movement of the masses by which the Popes were borne up to their earthly throne: "The men who have changed the world never obtained their success by gaining over the leaders, but always by stirring up the masses. The first method is the way of intrigue, which never brought about more than second-rate results; the second is the march of genius, which changes the face of the world."

I will wind up with an aphorism to which I cordially say, Amen: *Malheur à ceux qui ne respectent pas les traités!* (p. 97),—"Woe be to those who disregard treaties!"

---

## RUSSIA.

SIR,—You ask me for some general observations upon my country; but as I have been some time out of Russia, I can only communicate to you the impressions which still remain to me. And first, concerning the Latin or Polish Church. In this, as in all other matters, it is the fundamental principle of our government to destroy all things that can oppose its movements. Every living thing in our vast empire must be Russian, and must subsist in the completest and most absolute dependence upon the government. The whole empire is to become one vast *phalanstère* from which all nationalities and all individualities are to be wiped away. This, for the last hundred and fifty years, has been the Utopia of our rulers. And their great bugbear in their labour of assimilation has ever been Poland. The resistance of Poland depends on two things; its religion, and its national spirit. For a long time these two forces have been divorced from each other; those who were strongest for nationality were weakest for religion; a great part of the nobility was poisoned with a Voltairian infidelity. But this infidelity is gradually diminishing, and is on the way to disappear. In spite of the oppression which the Polish clergy has to put up with, it is daily improving both in education and in behaviour, and we have only to thank God for the present religious condition of the country, especially when we think of what it was thirty years ago. Community of sufferings has drawn together the patriots and the Churchmen, and both parties have been improved thereby. Nevertheless this fact, though palpable to the most slovenly inquirer, has not had the slightest influence on the conduct of our government. The successive demolition of our convents, the refusal to permit the repair of our dilapidated churches, the obstacles thrown in the way of vocations to the ecclesiastical state, the attempts to poison the springs of education, the

vexatious interference with the zeal of our Bishops and clergy, the spy-system carried into the smallest details, the faithful molested in the performance of their religious obligations, the purchase of apostasies, and, in a word, all the ancient proceedings of the persecution are still in full operation. It is clear that the desire of government is to suck all the blood out of the Polish Church, with a view to its union with the orthodox communion. For a long time this has been the path pursued. But, I repeat, there is now gradually springing up a happy reaction. The importance of this fact receives a vast accession from the new phase into which the Russian empire is now entering. It is useless to conceal the fact that an immense revolution is now in progress. The signs of the times are becoming daily more clear. The question of the abolition of serfdom still remains insoluble. Every one has his own solution to propose, but every one else rejects the solution. If the position of the serfs is to be improved by the emancipation, all the nobility is next door to ruined. But the destruction of the nobles in Russia would be every bit as disastrous as the ruin of the aristocracy in England. If the condition of the serfs becomes worse after the emancipation, the immense majority of the population will be on the verge of insurrection. At present, the serfs are made to respect their masters; what will follow when the bridle is broken, and when, after such a change of position, the same men continue to live close to each other? Fancy a disbanded regiment, deprived of its officers, but still living together in barracks! Such must be the position of the serfs after their emancipation. The government now sees all this. It wishes emancipation, because it is pledged much too loudly to be able to shirk; and yet it is unwilling, because it fears the consequences both to the serfs and to the proprietors: its wishes and its fears cancel each other, paralyse its movements, reveal its weakness to every eye, and discredit it more and more.

And this discredit of our government is a fresh evil. Throughout Russia a vast number of writings are being published, both by natives and by foreign residents. The tendencies of these publications are partly revolutionary, partly conservative; but it is very remarkable that they all agree about the existence and the intensity of the evils which are sapping the life of Russia. Whatever part of our administration they talk about, all is rotten. The army, the judges, the police, the civil administration, the navy, the treasury, the public works, the clergy, are all hopelessly shaken to the very foundations. From time to time an example is made; but these examples only serve to draw attention to the evil, without having the slightest remedial influence. The first step in any reform must be to double the pay of nearly all the *employés*, and then to be most severe in punishing abuses. But our finance ministers will never find the required funds, neither are our superiors capable of any strict supervision of their inferiors. Old habits would soon cause the accustomed extortions to be added to the double pay. This would be the whole effect of the reform. What is wanting is a public opinion to force the administration to bring the offending *employés* to justice.

But to form this public opinion we want a press or a tribunal permitted to reveal the abuses which the administration would conceal; and a press or a tribunal of this sort would put our whole machinery of government out of gear in less time than it took Mirabeau and his associates to destroy the old French monarchy, an institution whose solidity was of a very different order from the lath-and-plaster erection of Peter the Great. It is not difficult to divine the deplorable effect of this administrative corruption on the government. Few people have any thing to do with the heads of offices; but every one has his business with the lower officials, among whom corruption is most universal, their superiors being by no means spotless. Thus it comes to pass that the government presents itself to the governed in the character of the meanest and most barefaced swindler. This is the secret of the astonishing success of the sects which abound in Russia. The dishonesty of officials is, three times out of four, at the bottom of those continual secessions of the mercantile and industrial classes and of the serfs and peasants from the orthodox Church. The simple people conceive an equal hatred for the official Church and for the government which supports it, and which is in fact one with it. All these sects have an organisation, generally a very simple and solid one, depending on mutual confidence; the spirit of association, moreover, is deeply seated in the character of the Slave race; and herein lies a fresh danger to the government. If there were to arise a bold enterprising man, who knew how to set the masses in movement, a regular peasant-war would be the result. Our government knows and understands this peril; and to prevent it, has employed various measures of persuasion, of compulsion, and of letting things be,—with small success; often the measures had a result exactly contrary to that intended.

Such are the internal perils of our country. And where shall we find the remedy, or men to apply it? It is of much more importance to answer these two questions than to determine the nature of the evil; but I do not think that any one can answer them.

I mentioned just now the books upon Russia which are continually appearing: they are mostly published at Leipzig and at Paris. At Paris, a book has just come out which, I think, will make a great noise in Russia, if not throughout Europe. For you may depend it will get into Russia, in spite of the prohibition of the customs; and the very customs-officers, who are in the pay of the booksellers of Petersburg and Moscow, will help it in. Its title is, *La Vérité sur la Russie*, by the Prince Peter Dolgorouky. Its character may be summed up in two words—very bitter, but very true. It smashes every thing; nothing but the Imperial family is treated with the slightest respect. Now when you consider the name and position of the author, does not this seem a sign of the times? Would you believe that he has dared to insert a chapter upon liberty of conscience? In this chapter he gives an account of the horrors inflicted upon the Catholics at Dziernowice,—horrors which within the last two years have been described in detail by the Catholic press of France and Belgium, and, I suppose, of England too. By this means

the most efficacious publicity is secured for the abominable history. Another very interesting chapter is that devoted to the Russian clergy. After a sufficiently explicit profession of his faith in the orthodox Church, which he calls the only true Church of Jesus Christ, he demolishes the Russian clergy, though he always declares, and with some truth, that the clerical disorders are due rather to the government than to the clergy. He proves to demonstration that the seal of the confessional is habitually broken for the interests of the political spy-system. He protests with some eagerness, and again with some justice, against the notion, so universal in Europe, that the Emperor is the head of the Russian Church. He maintains that the orthodox Church has no other head than Jesus Christ, but, at the same time, he admits that the Emperor Nicolas behaved as if he was our Lord's Vicar; this comes to pretty much the same thing as an admission that he was the Pope of the Russian Church. The conclusion of his book is, that Russia is being dragged by an incapable and rapacious bureaucracy down a fatal steep, at the bottom of which it will inevitably, and that soon, find bankruptcy and revolution. The remedy which he proposes is constitutional government. I am not quite as well convinced as the author of the efficacy of this remedy. It would assuredly soon bring about immense changes. One very important truth which the writer tells is, that Russia is unable to bring into the field, outside its frontiers, an army of 150,000 men, and that for the simple reason, that outside the frontiers the troops would have to be paid in coined money, of which there is no sufficient supply. What he says about the armies of Germany is stronger still. According to Prince Dolgorouky, the only good German army *was* that of Austria: the Prussian army is a kind of great national guard, which would not hold together three weeks; while the little kings of Germany cannot agree either with Austria or with Prussia, and would most willingly join a confederation of the Rhine. These are the points in the book with which I have been chiefly struck.

In reading it, however, my ideas have been gradually led towards the foreign policy of Russia. With respect to the West, her policy is most reserved. She will make no more advances than are absolutely necessary. Those who have injured her most deeply are now seeking, if not her alliance, at least her friendship and her support. The reconciliation with France may possibly be consolidated; for France is, on the whole, the most natural ally of Russia. A kind of union may likewise be reëstablished between her and Austria. These two powers have the same interest in bridling the Poles and the Hungarians; but many a Russian has laughed heartily at Lord John Russell's announcement to parliament that he intended to propose a kind of league of the great powers against the annexation of Savoy to France. If Russia dislikes to see France grow greater, she dislikes still more the policy of England, which acknowledges neither principles, nor the rights of nations, nor honesty in the means she takes to execute her ends. You are much deceived if you imagine the nations of Europe, and especially Russia, to be disposed to be

tools for your selfish policy. Assuredly, unless the interests of Russia are directly at stake, she will never league herself with you. Your policy may come to as ridiculous a smash as it likes, your national pride may be humbled, your influence enormously decreased ; we shall only laugh heartily, as we laughed when Austria was beaten at Solferino, though our complaints against her were infinitely less than those we have against you. Do not imagine, then, that we shall take any active part in the affairs of the West. We have enough to do with the "sick man" in the East, and in our quality of neighbours we are specially interested in the legacy which his demise will leave open to us. Formerly the great question was, who should have Constantinople ? Now the question seems to be, who shall have Egypt ? In other words, the question is, how far we can shut you out from taking any share of the spoils ? Every Russian that I talk with thinks that France, Austria, and Russia will easily come to an understanding, if they have not come to one already. England is only considered as an immense embarrassment. In the mean time, European Turkey is becoming agitated ; the Sublime Porte takes such measures as it is capable of taking ; the nationalities huddled together in its dominions are daily gaining a clearer demarcation ; the agents of the various powers have their eyes open ; expectation is rising more and more on tiptoe. When the time comes, Russia will come forth from her retirement ; she will collect all her forces, and will rather expire in the violence of her efforts than miss the opportunity of establishing her power for ages. When this question is settled, we shall see whether Russia is to be the first power of the earth or a third-rate power.

I intended to finish with a recital of the endeavours that are being every where made to bring about a reconciliation between the Catholic and orthodox Churches ; but I must reserve what I have to say for another occasion.

April 15, 1860.

W.

## BELGIUM.

Brussels, April 14.

SIR,—The affairs of Belgium have, I suppose, their own interest for English Catholics. We are of the same race, and we live under institutions somewhat similar, except that our government is probably more like what yours would be after the passing of some extensive measure of reform. I think that you may gather some warnings from the conduct of our Liberals.

The measure now occupying our attention is M. Frère's project for the abolition of the *octroi*, or municipal tax levied at the gates of the towns. We are all agreed upon the advantage of abolishing this interior customs-duty, but we are at loggerheads about the way of doing it. M. Frère simply abolishes them, and distributes their burden over the whole country ; but in such a way that, instead of the towns being exceptionally taxed, the country-places will be most burdened, and, indeed, besides paying for themselves, will have to

pay three millions of francs for the towns. This project is popular enough in the towns, but not so in the country-places ; but it will be carried : the towns are so important in elections, that they must be conciliated. I do not feel so angry at the injustice of this act, as at the ill effects it is sure to produce in the long-run, by attracting the rural population to the towns. All over the Continent, owing to the increase of education and of wealth, and to the destruction of several rural manufactures, there is a tendency to desert the country for the town. In several departments of France, this tendency has become a complete plague. In Belgium, it has hitherto been kept back by the greater expense of living in the towns ; but when it is as cheap to live in town as in the country, fifty years will suffice to shift our population. In several rural districts labour is already scarce, while the towns are over-stocked.

The fortification of Antwerp is progressing silently but steadily ; but few persons trust to it for the safety of Belgium. If we wish successfully to resist a French invasion, we must do like the Poles under King Casimir, or like the Spaniards fifty years ago, and rise in a mass under the influence of patriotism. This renders it all the more desirable that government should avoid giving offence to any large party, as it does by its bill for the abolition of the *octroi*, and by the tone of the Liberal ministerial journals with respect to the affairs of Italy. All these papers cry out against the Pope, the de-throned princes, and the King of Naples. This is doubly foolish ; for it both wounds our Catholic feelings, and it moreover prepares our minds to suffer in our turn an annexation to France. Again, the travels of the Duke of Brabant are far from popular. We all know that ambitious ideas are the order of the day at Lacken ; and this knowledge we embroider as we please. The motives assigned by the official journals for his travels are curious, none more so than that given by the *Gazette de Cologne*. While Europe is wondering every morning whether a *casus belli* will not break out during the day, the duke, it appears, has gone to Vienna and Constantinople to complete his studies on the subject of the trade of the East. The day before yesterday, an Orleanist journal declared, semi-officially, that his journey to Constantinople was for the purpose of arranging for the purchase of Crete. *Communiqués* of this kind make the royal family, and especially the duke, ridiculous.

In Belgium a report was accredited, and is still far from discredited, that France and Prussia had come to terms ; that France was to annex the Rhenish provinces, and Prussia the smaller German states. In this case you would come to protect Belgium. But, thanks to your policy, which is universally detested and abhorred on the Continent, your presence would be very likely to be the signal for a universal shout of *Vive la France*.

Some persons have supposed that the Emperor knew beforehand and approved of the resolution of General Lamoricière to offer his services to the Pope. It would not be contrary to the system of Louis Napoleon, who likes to keep both his front and his back door open, even to have sent the general on this mission.



But the French government, which would now appropriate the honour, really had nothing to do with the initiative. The facts are these: Mgr. de Merode came to Belgium with an autograph letter of the Pope to the general. The general was summoned to Brussels, but he never showed himself at the Hôtel Merode, but remained *perdu* at M. Cattoir's, some distance away. There Mgr. de Merode sought him out, and fulfilled his commission. The French secret police at Brussels knew nothing of the matter; the French ambassador afterwards took great pains to find out something definite to tell his government, but he could discover nothing. Part of M. Cattoir's family did not know whom they had amongst them; and no one was invited to meet the general but his old confessor at Brussels. The first recruit that the general secured was the son of M. Cattoir, an excellent young man, and a most able mathematician and surveyor, who has been long known to the general, and whom he thinks equal to the best that France could supply. Mgr. de Merode and his two companions were again in Italy before the French government got an inkling of what had happened. On this there was a council of ministers, presided over by the Emperor. The question was, whether to authorise the general to accept service in a foreign country, yes or no? Almost all expressed an opinion in favour of authorising him. How could they do otherwise? They had, indeed, up to that time refused passports to young men who wanted to enlist in the Pope's army; but to refuse permission to the general was quite another matter. They had preached to the Pope about reforms: could they refuse him the use for this purpose of one of the cleverest organisers in France? This would be to throw off the mask too completely. Then General de Lamoricière, by his marriage, has entered the ranks of the French aristocracy; and it is well known that upon occasion he would give his help to the Restoration. To interdict him would have been simply to invite the young French royalists to join his standard in Italy, and there form the nucleus of an army whose future who could predict? It was determined, therefore, that permission should be given to the general. But this permission was not asked for. The nuncio at Paris received notice of the determination of the French government. Under the circumstances, this was equivalent to a command. He telegraphed to Rome; and the Roman government requested, through the French ambassador, the Emperor's permission for the general. The Emperor hastened to grant it; and the official journals were instructed to proclaim to France that the initiative belonged to him. But he cannot make much play out of this. Thank God, the attitude of Pius IX. has changed the game. He was to play St. Peter's part: *alius te cinget, et ducet quo tu non vis*. But now it is the Pope that leads, and another is in leading-strings.

Our collection of the Peter's-pence prospers. The Bishop of Ghent, as usual, was the first to move. He has found in his diocese 400,000 subscribers of twenty-five centimes a year, and donations to the amount of 80,000 francs. We shall see whether the other Bishops have a like success. The pastoral of the Cardinal of

Malines is to be read to-morrow. The Bishop of Ghent has one considerable advantage over his colleagues ; this is, that he makes far the most use of the lay element. By the Society of St. Vincent of Paul he has almost suppressed mendicity in his diocese. This society is his right hand for every thing. He supports it every where, and will never let it be injured by the opposition of the *curés*. It has been the great instrument for the collection of the *Romescot*, to which even the beggars have subscribed.

At the same time, the Counts de Meens and de Grelle, M. Jules Malou, and other financiers, are busy about the new Roman loan. According to the first instructions from Rome, the stock was to be issued at par bearing 5 per cent interest, and the names were to be inscribed at the Bishops' palaces. But our Bishops' houses are not frequented as they are in Italy, nor are our Bishops approachable by all the world. Moreover, since the old Roman 5 per cents are only at 80, and since, therefore, the new loan is in some measure an appeal to charity, it was thought much more likely to insure its success to make it still more so. So, with the consent of Rome, the conditions have been changed. The inscriptions are made at the banks, and the issue will be at par with interest at 4 per cent. The Count de Meens puts down his name for 100,000 francs ; others are equally generous ; we reckon that Belgium will lend at least 6,000,000 francs.

M. Jules Malou has just published an *Etude sur les chemins de fer Belges*. It ought to interest and instruct your countrymen. He proves that, with very few exceptions, all the Belgian railways constructed by private companies are losing concerns, and that those constructed by English companies are the worst, and have been conducted with least foresight and sense. I will extract a few figures relating to these undertakings. The Sambre-and-Meuse line has depreciated 12,000,000 out of a capital of 28,000,000. That of West Flanders has depreciated 10,700,000 out of a capital of 15,000,000. That of Tournay, Jurbise, and Landen-Hasselt, has lost 1,700,000 out of 13,700,000. That of Charleroi-Erquelines has lost more than 3,000,000 out of 20,000,000. That of Namur and Liège out of 37,500,000 has lost more than 8,000,000. That of Mons to Manage has lost 7,700,000 out of 13,000,000 ; and the Grand-Luxembourg, the vaunted El-Dorado, has lost 19,700,000 out of 74,800,000 ; and so on. I have only given the round sums. Thus have the English sown gold broadcast in Belgium, and have only their labour for their pains. These are the worst speculations that have ever been made in our country.

I will end with a fact that does not concern Belgium, but which I have on the best authority. When the *Te Deum* was to be chanted at Bologna for the annexation of Romagna, Cardinal Viale Prelà refused to allow it, and closed the doors of the cathedral. Several priests were applied to, and all refused to have any share in the ceremony. At last they fetched a priest (said to be interdicted) from the frontiers of Tuscauy, and he performed the function in one of the churches of the town.

Y. Z.

## Literary Notice.

*Palæontology; or, a Systematic Summary of Extinct Animals and their Geological Relations.* By Richard Owen, F.R.S. (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black.) Of this compendium it is sufficient to say, that whatever is written by Mr. Owen, the modern Cuvier, on his special subject, is sure to be the best in its kind. We notice the book only to quote some of the author's remarks on the antiquity of the human race, and on the successive origin of species.

On the first subject Mr. Owen, though affirming that man is geologically modern, yet makes no difficulty in allowing him the immense historical antiquity which new discoveries seem to oblige us to admit. Flint weapons, unquestionably fashioned by human hands, have been discovered in stratified gravel containing bones of the mammoth and extinct rhinoceros, stag, bear, and bison, in the valley of the Somme, near Abbeville and Amiens; in the bone-cave at Brixham, Devonshire; and in ossiferous caves in Palermo. Sir C. Lyell believes the antiquity of the Amiens flint instruments to be great indeed, if compared to the times of history or tradition. . . . It must have required a long period for the wearing down of the chalk which supplied the broken flints for the formation of so much gravel, sometimes 100 feet above the present level of the Somme; . . . and the disappearance of the elephant, rhinoceros, and other genera of quadrupeds now foreign to Europe, implies a vast lapse of ages (pp. 401-403). Ages, he says, not centuries.

With regard to the origin of species, Mr. Owen distinguishes the general proposition, "that new species are the result of *some* continuously operating second cause," from the particular proposition, that they are the result of a given hypothetical cause. The first, he says, may be entertained (as we showed that St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and the fathers, did entertain it\*) without necessitating the admission of any current hypothesis as to the second. Mr. Owen does not accept the theory of Mr. Darwin and Mr. Wallace, which we discussed in our last Number. "Observation of animals in a state of nature," he says, "is still required to show their amount of plasticity" (the amount of the *laxum* of the alteration of species), "or the extent to which varieties do arise. . . . Further discoveries of fossil remains are also needed to make known the antetypes" (the previous forms from which the later ones were derived) "in which varieties, analogous to the observed ones in existing species, might have occurred, *seriatim*, so as to give rise ultimately to such extreme forms as the giraffe." This application of palæontology Mr. Owen has always impressed upon his readers, and has contrasted the "more generalised structures" of extinct with the "more specialised forms" of recent animals.

"But observation of the effects of any of these hypothetical transmuting influences in changing any known species into another has not yet been recorded. And past experience of the chance aims of

\* See vol. ii. pp. 372, 373.

human fancy, unchecked and unguided by observed facts, shows how widely they have ever glanced away from the gold centre of truth."

The principles, he says, which seem to prove a continuously operative secondary creational law are, the law of irrelative or vegetative repetition; the law of unity of plan, or relations to an archetype; the phenomena of parthenogenesis; and the progressive departure from general type, as exemplified in the series of species from their first introduction to the present time.

We have made these quotations in order to confirm by the high authority of Mr. Owen the arguments which we ventured to put forward in March in reply to Mr. Darwin's theory.

## Current Events.

### HOME AFFAIRS.

#### *Home Policy.*

THE approval by the House of Commons of the Commercial Treaty with France, as a measure of trade, and as a political means of improving the relations between the two countries, was decidedly expressed before the end of February. Feb. 20, Mr. Disraeli's motion, which rebuked the government for their sin against form in combining the Budget and Treaty in one, was defeated by 293 to 230; Feb. 24, Mr. Du Cane's motion, which amounted to a substantial condemnation of the Budget founded on the Treaty, was lost by a majority of 116; and Feb. 28, a motion in favour of the protection of cork by Mr. Duncombe, though partly adopted by Mr. Gladstone, was beaten by 191 to 118. The government was supported in its commercial policy by Mr. Maguire, and other Irish members, who had habitually voted with the opposition.

*March 1.* Lord John Russell (who had introduced the first Reform Bill, March 1, 1831) brought forward his new measure of Reform. Simplicity was paramount in his scheme, and it was introduced in a speech extremely tame. The analysis of his bill is:

In England, qualification reduced to 10*l.* rental in counties, and 6*l.* in boroughs. In Scotland, freehold franchises from 10*l.* to 5*l.* No boroughs

entirely disfranchised, but those in England and Wales, which, with a population under 7000, now return more than one member, will lose the second member. Twenty-five boroughs lose one a-piece; and of the twenty-five seats thus at his disposal, Lord John Russell gives fifteen to certain populous counties; creates four new boroughs with one member each—Chelsea and Kensington, Birkenhead, Staleybridge, Burnley; and gives an additional member to Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, and Birmingham; also one to the University of London. The four seats of the disfranchised boroughs, Sudbury and St. Albans, go, two to Ireland—Cork County and Dublin City; and two to Scotland—Glasgow and the Scotch Universities.

Lord John Russell discarded his "fancy constituencies," and also the principle of the representation of minorities, which he had advocated in 1854, though this sacrifice was made with evident reluctance. He said:

"The House may remember that upon a former occasion I made a proposition which was not very palatable to the House, and which was certainly not popular in the country—viz. that there should be a division of votes; in other words, that where there were three members each elector should have only two votes. As

that proposition was not very popular, although I think it was a fair and just one, I shall not attempt to renew it upon the present occasion. I have observed, that where there are three members there is a growing feeling, arising from a sense of fairness and justice, that a very considerable party, though it may be the weaker, should not be altogether excluded from the representation, but that the third member should be given to it, though constituting a minority of the constituency. For a long time, chiefly because of that question of protection and free trade in which the agricultural counties felt a deep interest, those counties which now possess three members generally returned gentlemen all belonging to the same political party—the Conservative; but, on looking at the returns made to the last Parliament, I find that in five out of the seven counties which enjoy the privilege of electing three members each, two were of one party and one of the other. I regard it as a great benefit to those counties themselves, as well as to the country at large, that there should exist such a disposition not to exclude altogether a very strong minority, but to allow it to have part of the representation. I know it is said that the vote of the third member, the representative of a minority, neutralises the vote of one of the other two. That is not altogether true, because in many instances where the questions at issue are not directly party-questions, all three members may, and, we find, often do, vote together, although sitting on different sides of the House. I think, therefore, we shall not do wrong in giving three members to some of the more populous towns, as we have given three members to some of the larger counties."

He proposes, also, that the payment of assessed taxes be no longer a condition of voting, but the payment of the poor-rates is still to be required.

The three great measures of this Session, the Budget, the Commercial Treaty with France, and the Reform Bill, cannot be properly understood unless they are considered together. The Commercial Treaty and the repeal of certain customs duties, cre-

ate a deficit, not nearly compensated by the annuities that fall in this year. Mr. Gladstone provides for this deficit, *for one year only*, by a tenpenny income-tax, which will probably have to be extended to meet the supplementary estimates for army and navy. The income-tax is an impost on the upper classes; and the object of the Reform Bill is to give the lowest classes the preponderance in elections. A raw legislature will have to manipulate a deficit; and still worse, this legislature will probably represent the classes most interested in making the income-tax a permanent impost, and in still further reducing the poor man's burdens by economy in the defences of the country. The probable result of the policy represented by the three measures would be, in the course of a few years, a permanent income-tax of a shilling in the pound, a defenceless state of the country, and perpetual war-panics.

But within the last two months the Reform Bill has been losing favour in the eyes of the people, and has been all but lost by a count-out in the House of Commons. The Treaty with France, which was to ensure cordiality with that country for years to come, produced a cordiality that lasted exactly one fortnight, when it was rudely broken up by the annexation of Savoy; and the different interests which were being sacrificed to the Treaty have made themselves heard with effect. Mr. Gladstone has fairly fled before the assault of the publicans, who have frightened him out of his wine and beer licenses, which he proposed to grant to all vendors of eatables. The wine-licenses stand, but the beer-drinking at pastry-cooks' has yielded to the invincible morality of the great public-house interest. Several cases of great hardship occur likewise with regard to the silk, hop, and paper trades, which will go far to compel Mr. Gladstone to modify his first plans.

A Committee of the London Clergy which was appointed December 5th, to consult on the "Workhouse Question," has resolved: "That the attention of the Committee be directed to the following points in the order

in which they stand—1. The registration of religions; 2. The test of religion; 3. The punishment of false registration; 4. Separate schools and teachers for Catholic children; 5. Access of priests to Catholic inmates of workhouses and schools; 6. Attendance at Mass; 7. Appointment of chaplains; 8. Payment of chaplain." The Committee is also "of opinion that the following points ought to be arrived at:

"That in all workhouses and district union and other schools supported by the poor-rates, the creed-register shall be faithfully kept, and be open to inspection at all reasonable hours.

"That until the age of fifteen the religion of the child shall be ascertained by the following tests:

"1. As to children whose parent or parents are living—

"That the test of the religion of children . . . shall be the religion or reputed religion, or the known direction, of the parents or surviving parent.

"2. In the case of orphans—

"That the order of August 1859, in respect to orphan-children in workhouses, be extended to all orphans under the operation of the poor-law.

"That false or fraudulent registration be an offence punishable by the magistrate at the motion of any rate-payer, or of the person or persons aggrieved.

"That in registering the religion of any child, the grounds on which the religion has been determined . . . shall be entered.

"That separate schools for Catholic children be provided, to which such children detained in workhouses, &c. be sent for education, and supported out of the rates of the poor. These schools to be inspected like other Catholic schools, and the appointments of masters, &c., to be out of

the jurisdiction of the Poor-Law Board; and where no such school exists, the Catholic children to be allowed to attend any Catholic school within a reasonable distance; or, in default of this, to be placed in the charge of any person, being Catholic, certified as fit by the Poor-Law Board."

The other resolutions respect freedom of access for priests to workhouses, and the petitions and addresses to Parliament and to the Poor-Law Board which the Committee proposes to present.

In the mean time an agitation against the order of the Poor-Law Board of August 1859 has been organised by a "Committee of the Metropolitan Unions;" and those who know best the force of the inertia of Boards of Guardians, and the small power of the Poor-Law Board to bring them to reason, will have the most serious doubts of our speedy success. The question is much more a social than a legislative one; the best law in the world administered by Marylebone vestrymen might be used most tyrannously against us.

The Irish Bishops have put forth a long and ably argued reply to Mr. Cardwell's answer to their request for the abolition of the National System of Education. They find that Mr. Cardwell admits three principles—the paramount importance of religious education, the necessity for Ireland of separate religious training for the children of each religious denomination, and the rights of the heads of each Church to direct the religious education of the children of their own communion. They show how each of these principles is violated by the present system, and how the logical development of them can only conduct to that which the Bishops demand.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

### *Annexation of Central Italy to Piedmont.*

On the 15th of January Lord John Russell pointed out, in a despatch to Lord Cowley, that there was no hope

from a Congress, because "between the doctrine that it will be the duty of a Congress to restore the authority of the Pope in the Romagna, and the doctrine that no force ought to be used to impose a government

or constitution on the people of Central Italy, there can be no agreement." Hence he concluded that the crisis was favourable for a unity of policy between the English and French governments, and he thereupon made four propositions:

First, that France and Austria should agree not to interfere, for the future, by force in the internal affairs of Italy, unless called upon by the Five Great Powers.

Secondly, that the French troops should evacuate Rome.

Thirdly, that the internal government of Venetia should not be matter of European negotiation.

Fourthly, that, should the decision of the governments of Central Italy be in favour of annexation, Great Britain and France would permit Sardinia to enter those States in force.

On the 27th, Lord Cowley wrote that the Emperor agreed to the first proposition; that he was anxious to comply with the second, when the moment was opportune; to the third he agreed with an unimportant reservation; with regard to the fourth, though he personally considered it equitable that the destiny of Central Italy should be ascertained through the Assemblies, yet he could give no answer till he had set himself right with Austria in respect of the peace of Villafranca. Altogether the Emperor was inclined to accept the English propositions, "provided he could make them accord with his own situation with the court of Austria, on the one side, and with Prussia and Russia on the other." On the 30th of January Lord John Russell received an assurance from the court of Austria, "that the Imperial Cabinet had no intention of interfering by force of arms in the Italian States."

The Emperor, in communicating the English propositions to the Viennese cabinet, did not ask for its approbation, but confined himself to expressing a wish that it would abstain from any formal opposition to the execution of the plan.

Count Rechberg, in a despatch to Prince Metternich, at Paris, February 17th, courteously but firmly refused to have any thing to say to the English propositions, demanded the realisation of the conditions of Villa-

franca and Zurich, but at the same time declared that Austria would not necessarily go to war to support them. The following is his *résumé* of the situation:

"At the period of the signature of the preliminaries of Villafranca, the Emperor Napoleon hoped that the new organisation of Italy might be reconciled with the reëstablishment of the legitimate powers. That hope, in the mind of the Emperor Francis Joseph, amounted to a conviction, and induced him to consent to make a painful sacrifice, but under the condition that the legitimate authorities should be reinstated in Central Italy.

"In the interest of the restoration and consolidation of peace, he decided on renouncing his own rights; but he positively refused to consent to combinations which would have injured the rights of third parties, and particularly of princes who had calculated on his alliance. To oppose a barrier to the progress of revolution by the restoration of the dethroned sovereigns, and to assist the Emperor of the French in his project of a federative alliance, was the twofold object of the acts of Villafranca and Zurich.

"The Emperor has not changed his opinion; he still thinks, as at Villafranca, that it would be cherishing a dangerous illusion to think of founding a durable and regular order of things by a flagrant infringement of rights consecrated by centuries and by European treaties. 'France,' says M. Thouvenel, 'yields to none in her regard for the sanctity of obligations contracted.' We also entertain the same sentiment; and it is precisely on that account that we should deeply regret to see the treaty which has just been concluded between ourselves and France remain unexecuted in stipulations of considerable importance. Of course, if the restoration should not be realised, the confederation would also remain a dead letter.

"What would be the consequence? The thought of the two Emperors would remain sterile. And what are the obstacles which cause its failure? Without any intention to underestimate them, we are very far from thinking them insurmountable.

"Lastly, the Emperor thinks the solution is to be sought in the bases of Villafranca, all the stipulations of which, in a legal point of view, form but one complete whole. We could never consent to coöperate in any combinations which should not take into account the reserves made in the Treaty of Zurich in favour of the rights of the dethroned sovereigns, and should feel it morally impossible for us to sanction such combinations by our assent. This attitude is, in the eyes of the Emperor, not only a question of honour, but also the expression of a profound political conviction."

In another despatch of the same date Count Rechberg discusses the obstacles to the realisation of the treaty which the French government had found insurmountable. These were the inaction and passive attitude of the chiefs of those dynasties; the hesitation of the Sovereign of the States of the Church to grant reforms; and, lastly, the silence which Austria has obstinately kept on the subject of the generous intentions which were expressed to the Emperor Napoleon relative to the administration of Venetia. How, he asks, could the dethroned princes have acted at all? He loudly accuses the Sardinian government of the most disloyal interference, and asserts, with a certainty that has not been justified by the actual votes, that "the insurgent provinces are placed under a system of military dictatorship. Any step in favour of the legitimate sovereigns is prosecuted as a crime of high treason. Five-sixths of the population are excluded from the operation of voting; and those who have been admitted to exercise their electoral right have only voted under the pressure of the terrorism to which the dominant party has had recourse. How could the dethroned sovereigns be enabled to make their voices heard in the presence of so violent a state of things?" The Pope could not introduce his reforms at the moment when a factious assembly was pronouncing his downfall; and Austria could not give Venetia the promised constitution while Sardinian agents were keeping the province in the very vortex of revolution.

The peace of Villafranca, by the introduction of the non-intervention clause, had been the occasion of the resurrection of revolutionary activity. France, to put an end to this situation, proposed a European congress; Austria agreed; but France decided on adjourning its meeting to an indefinite period.

Finally, though the maintenance of the present uncertain state might lead to revolution and democracy, the acceptance of the English propositions would do no less.

On the receipt of these despatches France was enabled to declare its views, both to the government of Sardinia and to that of England. To the second it said, in a despatch dated February 24th, that it was now at liberty to discuss the fourth proposition: "What is the aim, or, rather, what would be the result of the proposition of the Cabinet of London? To call forth a fresh expression of the wish of the Central Italians, with the assent of France and England, in such a manner that this manifestation would receive from the previous adhesion of these two Powers a force in some sort legalised and regular." The French government could not "set free its moral responsibility unless the principle of universal suffrage, which constitutes its own legitimacy, became also the foundation of the new order of things in Italy." But it has no right to demand this, and abstains from advising the Italian governments to adopt the proposition, not only on this ground, but also because these governments would not lend themselves, except with a sort of repugnance, to a fresh manifestation which they consider to be useless, and of a nature to throw suspicion on the value and sincerity of preceding manifestations.

The despatch goes on to call attention to the different positions in which the French and English governments are respectively placed in regard to the Italian question:

"The course of events, during the past year, has thrown us into the necessity of sustaining the weight of a war. England, on the contrary, has been able, without harm to her interests, to remain in an attitude of expectation. If a European crisis should arise, or an Italian war break



out, England would always be free to withdraw at once into the post of simple observation. For France this course would be less easy; and she has the right, without opposing the wishes of Central Italy, or dictating to the Italians a solution suited only to her convenience, to take into her previous consideration, much more than England has any need to do, the elements of internal order and of external peace contained in the different solutions which may be offered for the great problem which holds at the present day all minds in suspense."

France has some claim to give advice to Sardinia, and to correct the illusions of that State concerning the aid which it counts upon receiving from France, but which will not be given unless it takes the advice of the French government.

On the same day M. Thouvenel addressed a despatch to M. de Talleyrand, the French minister at Turin, explaining the views of France. Her object was: (1) to prevent complications that might lead Italy to anarchy, and so compromise the results of the war; and (2) to procure the sanction of Europe to the solution, and so to place it, as soon as possible, under the protection of international law.

Two courses, then, are open to the Sardinian government,—either to adopt a combination such as the French Emperor suggests, or to take the consequences of the refusal.

1. The combination maturely considered by the French government was as follows:

"(1.) Complete annexation of the Duchies of Parma and Modena to Sardinia.

"(2.) Temporal administration of the Legations of the Romagna, of Ferrara, and of Bologna, under the form of a *vicariat* (lieutenancy), exercised by his Sardinian Majesty, in the name of the Holy See.

"(3.) Reestablishment of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in its political and territorial independence (*autonomie*)."

This scheme was recommended by many arguments: 1st. By the annexation of all these States, Sardinia would become weak through overgrowth. If Sardinia extends her territory too far, the work of assimila-

tion would present obstacles which she ought not to overlook. She would, in fact, find herself less powerful, and, especially, less mistress of her resolutions; she will be dragged along; she will no longer direct, and the impulsion which has made the strength and the success of Piedmont in these latter years will no longer emanate from Turin. Florence can only give up its independence out of hatred to the Austrian, not from love to the Piedmontese. The sentiment which brought forward in certain parts of Italy the idea of annexation, and which gave rise to the expression of that wish, is rather a manifestation directed against a great power than a well-considered attraction towards Sardinia. Such a sentiment, if not checked at the onset, could not fail to fall into errors which it would be the duty of the Turin Cabinet to oppose. The trifling annexation of Parma and Modena would not distract Sardinia too much, while the *vicariat* would be in harmony with the municipal spirit which is a secular tradition in the Romagnas, as with the natural influence which the power must exercise that has become mistress of the greater portion of the valley of the Po. Moreover, this manner of settlement would guarantee to Sardinia the position which is necessary to her in a political point of view, would satisfy the Legations in an administrative point of view, and in a Catholic point of view would constitute a mean which we hope would finally satisfy all scruples and consciences. Such a result could not be indifferent to France, as she could not in principle admit a radical dismemberment of the States of the Holy Father, without compensation; nor can it be indifferent to Sardinia. On the other hand, if Tuscany, that beautiful land so rich in historical glory, is still coveted, that aspiration (there must be no delusion in the matter) reveals on the part of those whom it carries along with it an *arrière-pensée* of a war against Austria for the conquest of Venetia, and an *arrière-pensée*, if not of revolution, at least of menace for the tranquillity of the States of the Holy See and of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. It is impossible to deceive public opinion in Italy or else-

where, and the question which it is our object to settle, would only be reopened more embittered than ever.

2. But if the Sardinian government perseveres in the policy of annexation, then the conclusion that the government of his Sardinian Majesty *would have to rely only on its own forces develops itself*, so to say, naturally, and it would be painful for me to dwell upon it. France will not at any price undertake the responsibility of such a situation. The interests of France will be the Emperor's sole guide in the matter.

The despatch concludes with claiming Savoy and Nice (saving the interests of Switzerland), as necessary for the safety of the French frontiers in the event of the Sardinian court persisting in its scheme of annexation.

*March 1.* The French Legislative Session opened with a speech of the Emperor, in which these various threads of Italian policy were cleverly combined with the English Commercial Treaty, which had just been approved in principle by several large majorities in the English Parliament.

"The dominant idea of the treaty of Villafranca was to obtain the almost complete independence of Venetia at the price of the restoration of the Archdukes. That transaction having failed, despite my most earnest endeavours, I have expressed my regret thereat at Vienna as well as at Turin, for the situation by being prolonged threatened to lead to no issue. While it was the object of frank explanations between my government and that of Austria, it suggested to England, to Prussia, to Russia, measures the whole of which clearly prove on the part of the Great Powers their desire to obtain a reconciliation of all the interests.

"To second these dispositions it was necessary for France to present that combination, the adoption of which would have the greatest chance of being accepted by Europe. Guaranteeing Italy by my army against foreign intervention, I had the right to assign the limits of that guarantee. Therefore I did not hesitate to declare to the King of Sardinia that, while leaving him full liberty of action, I could not follow him in a policy which had the fault of appearing in

the eyes of Europe a desire to absorb all the States of Italy, and which threatened new conflagrations. I counselled him to reply favourably to the wishes of the provinces which should offer themselves to him, but to maintain the independence of Tuscany, and to respect in principle the rights of the Holy See. If this arrangement does not satisfy every body, it has the advantage of reserving principles, of calming apprehensions, and makes Piedmont a kingdom of more than 9,000,000 souls.

"Looking to this transformation of Northern Italy, which gives to a powerful State all the passes of the Alps, it was my duty, for the security of our frontiers, to claim the French slopes of the mountains. This re-assertion of a claim to a territory of small extent has nothing in it of a nature to alarm Europe and give a denial to the policy of disinterestedness which I have proclaimed more than once; for France does not wish to proceed to this aggrandizement, however small it may be, either by military occupation or by provoked insurrection, or by underhand manoeuvres, but by frankly explaining the question to the Great Powers. They will doubtless understand in their equity, as France would certainly understand it for each of them under similar circumstances, that the important territorial rearrangement which is about to take place gives us a right to a guarantee indicated by nature herself.

"I cannot pass over in silence the emotion of a portion of the Catholic world; it has given way suddenly to such inconsiderate impressions, it has given itself up to such passionate alarms. The past, which ought to be a guarantee for the future, has been so much overlooked, the services rendered so much forgotten, that I needed a very deep conviction and confidence—an absolute confidence in public common sense, to establish in the midst of the agitations endeavoured to be excited that calm which alone maintains us in a proper path.

"Facts, however, speak loudly for themselves. For the last eleven years I have sustained alone at Rome the power of the Holy Father, without having ceased a single day to revere

in him the sacred character of the chief of our religion. On another side the population of the Romagna, abandoned all at once to themselves, have experienced a natural excitement, and sought during the war to make common cause with us. Ought I to forget them in making peace, and to hand them over anew for an indefinite time to the chances of a foreign occupation? My first efforts have been to reconcile them to their Sovereign; and, not having succeeded, I have tried at least to uphold in the revolted provinces the principle of the temporal power of the Pope. My government will immediately present to you a series of measures, the object of which is to facilitate production, to increase, by affording the means of living cheaply, the prosperity of those who labour, and to multiply our commercial relations. The first step to be taken in this path was to fix the period for the suppression of those impassable barriers which, under the name of prohibitions, have shut out from our markets many productions of foreign industry and constrained other nations to adopt an annoying reciprocity with regard to us.

"But something still more difficult still impeded us. It was the little inclination for a commercial treaty with England. I have therefore taken resolutely upon myself the responsibility of this great measure. A very simple reflection proves its advantages for both countries. Neither the one nor the other assuredly would have failed within a few years to take, each in its own interest, the initiative of the measures proposed; but then, the lowering of tariffs not being simultaneous, they would have taken place on one side and on the other without immediate compensation. The Treaty has done nothing more, then, than to anticipate the period of salutary modifications, and to give to indispensable reforms the character of reciprocal concessions, destined to strengthen the alliance of two great peoples. In order that this Treaty may produce its best effects, I invoke your most energetic coöperation for the adoption of the laws which will facilitate its practical adoption."

The effect of this clever union of

measures was doubtless to annul the force of the English protest against the annexation of Savoy and Nice. For a moment, the Emperor consented to appear in the eyes of France as a humble suitor to England, and as accepting at her hands a treaty and a policy that offended equally the clergy, the army, and the manufacturers, in order that he might more brilliantly defy Europe by the claim of "the natural frontiers of France." His words, "*réclamer les versants Français des montagnes,*" and "*cette revendication d'un territoire,*" gave great offence, as implying a claim, scarcely dormant, to all territories ever comprised within the limits of the first empire.

On March 6 was published Count Cavour's reply to the French propositions of Feb. 24, which had been echoed in the Emperor's speech of March 1. He says that if they had been proposed last August, the inhabitants of Central Italy would probably have adopted them with enthusiasm; but now, after their long and successful experiment of self-government, and after the publication of the English propositions, they would be almost unanimously rejected. The Pope would be no more likely to accept the vicariate of Victor Emmanuel than the Romagnoles their modified subjection to the Papal government.

"The idea of a vicariate, implying that of a direct interference of the Court of Rome in their internal administration, would encounter a resistance only to be overcome by force. Subjected to the test of popular suffrage, that proposition would hardly meet with any favour. It is, moreover, evident that the Holy Father would not accept this combination, however inspired it might be by the desire of saving his rights, and of not lowering the high position which he occupies in Italy. What has, in point of fact, hitherto prevented his Holiness from consenting, I do not say to measures calculated to limit his sovereign authority, but even to reforms which were suggested to him by all Europe, is the fear of incurring the responsibility of acts which, though in conformity with the principles in force in the greater number of civilised countries, might lead to

certain results contrary to the precepts of religious morality, of which the Sovereign Pontiff justly considers himself the supreme guardian. A very recent fact corroborates this assertion. When France desired to put an end to the occupation of Rome, she requested the Holy See to form a national army, like the other European Powers. The Roman government replied, that the Holy Father could not admit of the conscription, because it was repugnant to his conscience to force a great number of his subjects into a celibacy even temporary. The institution of a vicariate would not prevail over these scruples. The Holy Father, regarding himself as indirectly responsible for the acts of his vicar, would certainly not allow him the liberty of action necessary to permit the proposed plan to have any useful result."

Count Cavour proposes, instead of a vicariate, the Sardinian sovereignty in the Romagna, coupled with various engagements of the King to the Pope—namely, the obligation of acknowledging the Pope's independent sovereignty, of defending his independence by force of arms, and of paying a fixed contribution towards the expenses of the Roman court.

The question of annexation, therefore, will be put to the vote of the various populations (according to the demand of France, in M. Thouvenel's despatch to the French minister at London), and, in spite of all risks, King Victor Emmanuel and the Sardinian Cabinet will accept their decision. Tuscany would form an element of strength instead of weakness, when annexed to Sardinia, and would strengthen the liberal-conservative party of order by her manners and her traditions. A new elected prince would be still more offensive to Russia and Austria than King Victor Emmanuel himself, and the isolated State would be in the greatest peril, its feebleness make it the focus that would attract the discontented from all parts, and it would soon become a dangerous centre of revolution.

In accordance with these principles a decree had already been made (March 1), convoking the people of the various States to vote by universal suffrage and the ballot on

the alternative—annexation to Sardinia, or a separate kingdom. The vote was taken March 12. Its results were, in the Romagna :

|                            |         |
|----------------------------|---------|
| For annexation to Piedmont | 200,669 |
| For a separate kingdom     | 244     |
| Cancelled                  | 283     |

And in Tuscany :

|                                     |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| Total number inscribed on the lists | 386,445 |
| For annexation                      | 366,571 |
| For a separate kingdom              | 14,925  |
| Cancelled                           | 4,949   |

For the whole Æmilian provinces :

|                                                 |         |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Total number of electors inscribed on the lists | 526,258 |
| Number who voted                                | 427,512 |
| For annexation to Piedmont                      | 426,006 |
| For a separate kingdom                          | 756     |
| Cancelled                                       | 750     |

As soon as the result was known (March 14), it was announced that

"The Sardinian government has consented to the demand of France to effect the cession of Savoy and Nice by a special treaty, to be concluded between France and Piedmont.

"The treaty will be followed by a vote of the municipalities, and the two contracting parties will afterwards communicate to the European Powers the nature of and motives for this territorial arrangement between them.

"By this arrangement Sardinia cedes to France Savoy up to Mont Cenis, and Nice up to Villefranche inclusive. Thus all the passes of the Alps will be possessed by France, which likewise obtains the districts of Chablais and Faucigny."

*Sunday, March 18.* Signor Farini placed the returns of the voting in the Æmilian provinces in the King's hands. He replied :

"This manifestation of the national will is so universal and so spontaneous, that it confirms to Europe, at a different time and under altered conditions, the vote already expressed by the National Assemblies of Æmilia. This manifestation completes the proofs of the order, perseverance, patriotism, and wisdom by which those people have merited universal sympathy and esteem. I accept their solemn vote, and henceforth will be proud to call them my people. In uniting to my ancient provinces not only the States of Modena and Parma,

but also the Romagna, which has already separated itself from the Papal government, I do not intend to fail in my deep devotion to the Chief of the Church. I am ready to defend the independence necessary to the supreme minister of religion, the Pope, to contribute to the splendour of his court, and to pay homage to his sovereignty.

"Our parliament in receiving the representative of Central Italy will ensure prosperity, liberty, and independence to the new kingdom."

And the next day the decree of annexation was published in the *Piedmontese Gazette*.

March 24. The Austrian government issued a protest against the annexation of Central Italy to Sardinia. The protest is based on the rights of the house of Austria to the succession of Tuscany and Modena, and the reversion of Parma and Piacenza. In each of these cases to recognise the annexation would be to sacrifice the rights of the empire, which have been confirmed by treaties to which Sardinia was a party.

In a circular note accompanying the protest, Austria intimates that in confining herself at present to a protest, she is actuated only by the wish of avoiding war at this juncture; by which it seems to be implied, that she considers herself at liberty to convert her protest into hostilities, should a favourable occasion be found.

Cardinal Antonelli, in a despatch to M. de Thouvenel, had already (Feb. 29) given his reasons why the Pope could never consent to this measure.

The Romagnoles, he says, were no more dissatisfied than the inhabitants of the other provinces, who did not think of revolting, neither would the Romagnoles but for the intrigues of Piedmont. The Pope was most anxious to introduce administrative reforms; but they can be no longer proposed, since the provisional government has declared that it will be only satisfied with the complete destruction of the Pope's temporal authority. To have offered them would not have been conformable to the dignity of the Sovereign Pontiff, nor suitable to achieve the object in view. On the one hand, it would have appeared as if the concessions were

made under pressure, and not voluntarily; on the other hand, there was the danger that the reforms might have been disdainfully received. In either case authority would have suffered.

The French Cabinet had proposed a separate administration, with an elective council, with no other dependence upon the Sovereign Pontiff except the nomination by him of a lay governor and the payment of a tribute.

This was equivalent to an absolute abdication, and the Pope could never consent to it. "He cannot do so, because his States are not his personal property, but belong to the Church, for whose advantage they were constituted; he cannot do so, because by solemn oaths he has promised to God to transmit them to his successors intact, as he received them; he cannot do so, because, considering that the motives for giving up the Romagna may be applicable, or may follow, in other portions of his States, such renunciation would imply, in a certain degree, the renunciation of the whole patrimony of the Church; he cannot do so, because, as common father of his twenty-one provinces, he must either procure for all the good he destines for the four provinces of the Romagna, or shield the latter from the evils which he should not like to see fall upon the others; he cannot do so, because it cannot be indifferent to him to behold the spiritual ruin of a million of his subjects, who would be abandoned to the mercy of a party which would commence by laying snares for their faith and by corrupting their morals; finally, he cannot do so, because of the scandal that would ensue to the detriment of the Italian princes *de facto* unthroned, and also to the detriment of all Christian princes, and of the whole of civilised society,—a scandal which could not fail to arise when the felony of a faction is seen crowned with such success."

M. de Thouvenel had urged that what Pius VI. did by the Treaty of Tolentino, Pius IX. could do now. The Cardinal answers, that Pius VI. ceded parts of his States to mere material force; whereas Pius IX. is required to sanction the principle of revolution, which might as legiti-

mately be applied to any other portion of his States as to the Romagna. "Thus Pius VI., by ceding to material force, might reasonably hope to save the rest of his States; while the reigning Sovereign Pontiff, ceding to a pretended principle, would virtually abdicate the sovereignty of all his States, and would authorise a spoliation against every principle of justice and of reason."

The French government had declared that it was impossible that the Roman States should be any longer maintained by foreign intervention; Cardinal Antonelli replies: "But if it is true, and it is impossible to doubt it, that the revolt of the four Legations was made and is maintained by the means of a party which owes its power to foreign help, and to hopes of still greater assistance, I do not see why a rebellion made by iniquitous foreign aid should not also be suppressed by legitimate foreign aid. Again, can it be said that aid given by Catholic nations to their common father, and in the interests of the whole Christian universe, can be styled foreign assistance?"

*April 1. The opening of the Piedmontese Chambers.*—The King, in his speech, first spoke of gratitude to France, and of the sacrifice of Savoy and Nice which it required. This disgraceful sale of the oldest portion of his dominions was glossed over with the declaration that he would "not suffer any violation or diminution of the rights or freedom of his people." Then he protested his allegiance to the Catholic faith, and to the Pope. Nevertheless, he accepted the revolted provinces. "The Æmilian provinces," he said, "have received an organisation similar to that of my ancient States. In Tuscany a special provisional arrangement was found necessary. We shall found our constitution on political, military, and financial unity, as well as on the uniformity of civil and criminal legislation; while by the progressive administrative liberty of the provinces and communes, we shall renew in the Italian people that splendid and vigorous life which under other phases of civilisation was the result of municipal self-government,—a *self-government inconsistent* at the present day with the constitu-

tion of strong States, and the tendency of the nation." Then he invited all parties to unite for the furtherance of the greatness of the country, "which can no longer be the Italy of the Romans, nor yet the Italy of the middle ages; which must no longer be the open battle-field for foreign ambition, but must, at last, be the Italy of the Italians."

The Pope, however, did not take the same view of the fidelity of the King of Sardinia as that monarch himself did. On the 29th of March he published an Apostolic Letter, by which the punishment of major excommunication is inflicted on the invaders and usurpers of some of the pontifical provinces.

The Catholic Church, he says, after having once attained its perfect social form, ought to be free from subjection to any civil power; this freedom is guaranteed by conditions varying with circumstances. After the fall of the Roman empire, the guarantee assumed the form of independent temporal power. Thus the Pope was assured of the political liberty requisite to exercise his spiritual jurisdiction throughout the world without any impediments, and the Catholic world was delivered from all reasons for suspecting that his religious functions were biased by political motives. In this way the temporal power, though secular in appearance, has really a spiritual character, in consequence of its holy destination, and the close ties with which it is connected with all Christian affairs. But the spiritual character of the government has not prevented it from seeking the temporal welfare of its subjects, as the history of so many centuries proves: nevertheless, it provokes the enemies of the Church to endeavour to weaken and embarrass it.

These detestable attempts to deprive the Church of her secular power have been characterised by lying hypocrisy, by false and pernicious principles, by cunning dissimulation, and by provoking popular risings, in distinct opposition to the apostolic precept (Rom. xiii. 1, et seq.). The innovators feign esteem for the Church which they attack, and obedience to her commands which they despise. Among them are some whose duty

it was, as sons of the Church, to protect her and maintain her power. The Sardinian government is the chief offender; the injuries inflicted by it on the Church in Sardinia were lamented in an Allocution of Jan. 22, 1855; but it has hitherto despised all reclamations, and has gone on to inflict a further injury on the secular power of the Church. The first overt tokens of the attack were made at the Paris Congress in 1856, when Sardinia proposed to weaken the temporal authority of the Holy See. But in 1859, during the war against Austria, every fraudulent method was used to excite the inhabitants of the States of the Church to sedition. Emissaries were despatched, money was distributed, arms supplied, incendiary writings disseminated, even from the Sardinian embassy at Rome, which asserted its dignity in order to misuse it, and to pursue its projects under the protection of its privileges. When at last the smouldering sedition blazed out, the agitators were ready to proclaim the dictatorship of the King of Sardinia, and his commissioners undertook to govern the provinces. Protests against these acts were made in the Allocutions of June 20 and Sept. 26, 1859, and the liability of the perpetrators of them to excommunication was pronounced. The Bishops and faithful of every rank and class joined unanimously in these protests, because they comprehended the necessity of the temporal power for the maintenance of the Papal government. But the Sardinian government has made light of every admonition; has by force, money, threats, terror, and other means, obtained a universal vote in its favour; and has invaded, occupied, and annexed the Papal provinces.

In this usurpation of the rights of others against all law natural and divine, the bases of all temporal power and of human society have been undermined. But, on one hand, it is useless to complain to those who will not listen; and on the other, the whole Catholic world looks for the employment of the proper ecclesiastical censures against the guilty, in order to give an example to others.

Then follows the sentence of excommunication: no one is named therein; but it applies to "all those

who have taken part in the sinful insurrection in our provinces, in usurping, occupying, or invading them, or in doing the deeds complained of in the Allocutions of June 20 and Sept. 26, 1859, whether themselves or their warranters, supporters, helpers, counsellors, followers, and connivers, under whatever pretence, and in whatever, even the remotest, manner;" absolution only to be granted *in articulo mortis*, but revoked on their recovery, and suspended till they have revoked and annulled publicly all that they have done, brought back every thing fully to its former state, and given complete satisfaction to the Papal government.

Then follow the usual directions for the publication and authentication of the letter.

The only other step in the progress of these events that we need record is the protest of the Papal government, dated April 18, delivered to all the European governments, against the incorporation of the Legations with Piedmont. It expresses a hope that the powers will not only refuse to recognise the annexation, but will also coöperate to put an end to this iniquitous spoliation.

#### *The Annexation of Savoy to France.*

It appears that the Sardinian government, anxious rather for the enlargement of its own provinces than for the liberties of the people for whom it fought, bargained with the Emperor Napoleon III. to concede Savoy and Nice to him, provided he assisted them in accomplishing the expulsion of the Austrians from Italy. The bargain was not only kept secret, but was explicitly denied by both governments. The Sardinian government went so far as to promise "that they would neither sell, exchange, nor surrender this territory;" and the French government had over and over again solemnly declared that it aimed at no territorial aggrandisement. In the Emperor's proclamation at Milan, he said, "it is the common enemies of Lombardy and France that try to make Europe believe that I made the war only from personal ambition, and to enlarge the French territory." "The empire," he said to his Chambers, "threatens

no man;" its aim is "to console and reassure humanity." France is the only nation that acts chivalrously, that "goes to war for an idea."

However, after the failure of the Emperor before the Quadrilateral, the bargain seemed to be evacuated; and Sardinia had an opportunity of repentance, and of refusing to sell the liberties of near a million of people who for centuries have been the mainstay of her existence and the rock of her defence. But she has made this unworthy sacrifice to obtain the French consent to the usurpation of Tuscany and the Romagna.

After this act was consummated, France immediately claimed the performance of the contract. In a despatch of March 13th, M. de Thouvenel gives the reasons for the act; he still has the hardihood to assert that "solemn acts" have furnished an irrefragable proof, that in entering on the Italian war France "had not for object any territorial aggrandisement." If the government could have foreseen that circumstances would have arisen, such as to compel them to make the demand, they would have taken all means to prevent such circumstances from arising; as, indeed, they could not have arisen, if the treaties of Villafranca and Zurich had been fulfilled. But since Sardinia has profited by the agitation in Central Italy, the case is altered. An overwhelming reason has emerged why France, from mere self-protection, must seek guarantees against her powerful neighbour.

"It is impossible to dispute the fact that the formation of a considerable State, possessing both slopes of the Alps, is an event of the highest gravity with regard to the security of our frontiers. The geographical situation of Sardinia acquires an importance which it could not have when that kingdom hardly counted 4,000,000 souls, and was, in some sort, held by a great number of conventions to be external to the Peninsula. With a development which must nearly triple its population and its material resources, the possession of all the passes of the Alps would permit it, in the case of its alliances ever making it our adversary, to open access to our territory to a foreign army, or by its own forces to disturb

the security of an important part of the empire by intercepting our principal line of military and commercial communication. To demand guarantees against an eventuality of which the occurrence, however distant we may suppose it to be, does not diminish the peril, is simply to obey the most legitimate considerations and the most ordinary courses of international polity, which never at any period has assumed gratitude and sentiment as the one basis of the relations of States."

This dread of allowing his neighbours to grow powerful is an old idea with the Emperor Napoleon. During the war of 1849, between Austria and Piedmont, the Piedmontese government seized the papers of a French secret agent, and found that his instructions were to endeavour to prevent any accession of territory on the part of Sardinia at the expense of the Austrians.

But the conduct of Sardinia was the more discreditable, in that the burden of the sacrifice did not fall solely on her, but on Switzerland also; a country which had gained nothing, and therefore had nothing to pay. The northern parts of Savoy have such strategical importance with regard to the Swiss Republic, that the Congress of Vienna in 1815 made a special provision: "That the provinces of Chablais and Faucigny shall be included in the neutrality of Switzerland; that the Sardinian troops may retire by the route of the Valais; that the armed troops of no other power shall either remain in or pass through these provinces, with the exception of such as the Helvetic Confederation may think proper to station there."

As this provision was made against France, the absorption of those provinces by France was the most flagrant breach which it was capable of suffering. Naturally enough the Swiss government protested. M. de Thouvenel replied, March 17th, that the French government was surprised that Switzerland had not more confidence in the justice of France than to protest. And he laid down with the utmost decision the following law, which changes all subjects into serfs attached to the soil, liable to be sold with it to other owners:



"In principle, sovereignty implies essentially the right of alienation. A sovereign may, whatever be the motives that actuate him, cede the whole or a part of his States; and none would be justified in opposing either measure unless there should result from it any disturbance of the balance or distribution of power in Europe. His Majesty the King of Sardinia is therefore free, according to his prerogatives, to renounce the possession of Savoy in favour of France. This first point cannot be disputed, and is not capable, in strict right, of becoming the object of any doubt, or of raising any legal difficulty."

The plain means of solving this difficulty was to annex Chablais and Faucigny to Switzerland; but this would have spoiled the value of a Naboth-portion, which Mr. Bright calls a mere barren rock, but which Napoleon III. has pronounced to be an acquisition which will not only open the great Simplon road, but will also give to France "*la liberté des Alpes, et en cas de guerre un magnifique champ de bataille pour une lutte offensive et défensive.*" Hence, March 21, a so-called deputation from Savoy was got up, which was received by the Emperor at the Tuileries, and which told him that one impulse towards France thrilled through all Savoy. But "one single anxiety has alone hitherto impeded the impulse, the fear of seeing dismembered in favour of Switzerland a nationality compact by affection and by so many links of every description."

This address enabled the Emperor to answer:

"My friendship for Switzerland made me look upon it as possible to detach in favour of the Confederation some portions of the territory of Savoy; but, in face of the repulsion shown among you at the idea of seeing a country dismembered which has known how to create for itself through centuries a glorious individuality, and thus give itself a national history, it is natural to declare that I will not constrain the wishes of the populations to the profit of others. As regards the political and commercial interests which unite certain portions of Savoy to Switzerland,

it will be easy, I think, to satisfy them by special arrangements."

And the deputation vanished, no one knows whither, as no one had known whence it came.

March 22, Lord John Russell wrote a spirited answer to M. de Thouvenel's despatch. He calls to mind the assurance given by Count Walewski, in July 1859, that the scheme for the annexation of Savoy, if it ever existed, had been entirely abandoned. He shows the absurdity of France, with 36,000,000 inhabitants, fearing invasion from Sardinia, even though in one year it had increased from a state of 4,000,000 to one of 12,000,000 inhabitants. He shows that Sardinia is not likely to become a member of a confederacy against France: first, because no such confederacy is possible, except to repel French aggression; therefore "France has it at all times in her own power to prevent the formation of any such confederacy;" and, secondly, because of late years Sardinia has been attracted towards France, and has altogether left the Austrian alliance. Then he shows that the annexation is calculated to give the greatest umbrage to the European powers, because France's "former and not very remote policy of territorial aggrandisement brought countless calamities upon Europe;" and the grounds of the claim are calculated to heighten the distrust, because, if a great military power like France is to demand the territory of a neighbour upon its own theory of what constitutes geographically its proper system of defence, it is evident that no State could be secure from the aggressions of a more powerful neighbour; that might, and not right, would henceforward be the rule to determine territorial possession; and that the integrity and independence of the smaller States of Europe would be placed in perpetual jeopardy.

The despatch concludes by showing how France cannot fulfil the engagements of Sardinia towards Switzerland for the neutralising of Northern Savoy, because these engagements "were intended as a security for Switzerland against danger coming from France;" and by deprecating a measure which would renew the distrust of Europe for the first empire.

Lord John Russell repeated and confirmed the language of the despatch in a debate in Parliament of March 26. He declared his opinion to be "that such an act as the annexation of Savoy is one that will lead a nation so warlike as the French to call upon its government, from time to time, to commit other acts of aggression (*hear, hear*); and therefore I do feel that, however we may wish to live on the most friendly terms with the French government—and certainly I do wish to live on the most friendly terms with that government (*cheers*)—we ought not to keep ourselves apart from the other nations of Europe (*loud cheers from both sides of the House*); but that, when future questions may arise—as future questions may arise—we should be ready to act with others, and to declare, always in the most moderate and friendly terms, but still firmly, that the settlement of Europe, the peace of Europe, is a matter dear to this country; and that settlement and that peace cannot be assured if it is liable to perpetual interruption (*loud cheers*), to constant fears, to doubts and rumours with respect to the annexation of this one country, or the union and connection of that other; but that the Powers of Europe, if they wish to maintain that peace, must respect each other's rights, must respect each other's limits, and, above all, restore and not disturb that commercial confidence which is the result of peace, which tends to peace, and which ultimately forms the happiness of nations" (*loud cheers*).

The former policy of the government has, however, rendered a European coalition against France, under the hegemony of England, quite out of the question; and Lord John Russell has recorded the rebuffs that he received when he first proposed it. "The Austrian government said in the first instance that the annexation of Savoy to France was not worse, at all events, than the annexation of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany to Sardinia, and that it was a question in which they had less interest. But we know besides that the Emperor of Russia has said that it was free to the King of Sardinia to give away his own province,

and that it was free for the Emperor of the French to receive it; and therefore it was impossible that a foreign sovereign could interfere."

The annexation, therefore, has been consummated, in spite of repeated protests of Switzerland, and in spite of the terror of Belgium and Prussia, and has been confirmed by a vote of the Savoyards, which shows that under the French system of managing universal suffrage, a nation of free mountaineers may be made to vote for their enslavement to the most capricious despotism in the world, with quite as much unanimity and fervour as the Central Italians can be made to vote for annexation to Sardinia, in order to free themselves from Papal and Austrian servitude. Universal suffrage enacts contradictions with equal facility; unequal to the comprehension, much less to the maintenance, of liberty, it is only fit to be the instrument of despotism and revolution.

March 24, the following treaty was signed at Turin.

"Art. 1. His Majesty the King of Sardinia consents to the annexation (*réunion*) of Savoy and of the *arrondissement* of Nice (*circondario di Nizza*) to France, and renounces for himself and all his descendants and successors his rights and claims to the said territories. It is agreed between their Majesties that this *réunion* shall be effected without any constraint upon the wishes of the populations, and that the governments of the Emperor of the French and of the King of Sardinia shall concert together as soon as possible on the best means of appreciating and taking note of (*constater*) the manifestations of those wishes.

"Art. 2. It is also understood that his Majesty the King of Sardinia cannot transfer the neutralised portions of Savoy except upon the conditions upon which he himself possesses them; and that it will appertain to his Majesty the Emperor of the French to come to an understanding on that subject as well with the Powers represented at the Congress of Vienna as with the Helvetic Confederation, and to give them the guarantees which result from the stipulations alluded to in the present article.

"Art. 3. A mixed commission will determine, in a spirit of equity, the frontiers of the two States, taking into account the configuration of the mountains and the necessity of defence.

"Art. 4. One or more mixed commissions will be charged to examine and to resolve, within a brief delay, the divers incidental questions to which the annexation will give rise; such as the decision of the contribution of Savoy and of the *arrondissement* of Nice to the public debt of Sardinia, and the execution of the obligations resulting from contracts entered into with the Sardinian government, which, however, engages to terminate itself the works commenced for cutting a tunnel through the Alps (Mont Cenis).

"Art. 5. The French government will take into account, as regards functionaries of the civil and military order, belonging by their birth to the province of Savoy, or to the *arrondissement* of Nice, and who will become French subjects, the rights which they have acquired by services rendered to the Sardinian government; they will especially enjoy the benefits of life-appointments in the magistrature and of the guarantees assured to the army.

"Art. 6. Sardinian subjects originally of Savoy, or of the *arrondissement* of Nice, or domiciled actually in those provinces, who would wish to maintain the Sardinian nationality, will enjoy, during the period of one year, dating from the exchange of the ratifications, and in virtue of a previous declaration made to the competent authorities, the faculty of removing their domicile to Italy, and settling there, in which case their qualifications as Sardinian citizens will remain to them.

"They will be at liberty to keep their landed property situate on the territory annexed to France."

#### *Austria and Hungary.*

April 19. The Archduke Albert retired from the post of governor of Hungary, and was provisionally succeeded by Feldzeugmeister Benedek in the civil government, as well as the military command. At the same time the five districts into which the country had been divided were abol-

ished, and the administrative unity of Hungary was restored. Francis Joseph adds:

"In accordance with these dispositions, I ordain that when the municipal laws and county administrations are in activity, propositions respecting a Diet shall be prepared, in order that the principle of self-government, by means of town, district, or county communes, and of diets and committees of the same—which principle is to be introduced into all the provinces of the empire—may also be in force in my kingdom of Hungary."

This measure is undoubtedly a great concession to the Hungarians, and must lead to considerable changes. It is a concession, inasmuch as it restores the unity of Hungary, and gives it the dignity of a political and administrative whole, and because it places at the head of the government of the country a Hungarian of great reputation. But it must not be considered a surrender of the policy of the last ten years, and there is very little probability that it will satisfy the aspirations of the Hungarians.

It has been the just aim and endeavour of the Emperor Francis Joseph to establish the utmost unity and concentration of power in an empire full of centrifugal elements. His object was to introduce a system of concentration, founded on self-government; not, as has been often said, a system of centralisation. Self-government consists in preserving in the hands of the several physical or moral persons of which the nation is composed the administration of those things of which it is not the right and the duty of the State to assume the direction. It renders men independent of the State in certain phases and relations of life. This is not what the Austrian and Hungarian opposition demands. Their notion of liberty is a physical geographical independence, by which the empire loses power, and the people obtain no freedom. They ask not for the self-government of the Hungarians severally, but of Hungary jointly.

There are three principal views respecting the function of the State. When it is in its infancy, whole

classes of society, whole districts of the country, are exempt from its authority. This is the feudal notion of government, by which the sovereign power is locally limited, not politically circumscribed. Thus each estate possessed the right of taxing itself, or even of refusing taxes. Thus Philip I. could levy neither troops nor taxes in the kingdom of Aragon. But the feudal system protected men only by exempting them from the jurisdiction of the sovereign. Those who were not so exempt, or who were subject to other authorities, had little or no political protection, and preserved only moral safeguards of their rights. Hence in those ages the enormous political influence of the Church. Hence too the fact, that in the age in which absolutism was most completely unknown, tyranny was most common. This is practically the ideal at which the conservative party in Hungary aims. They seek to restore a system by which Hungary stood to Austria in the position of Aragon to Castile, or rather of Hanover to England, and by which the predominant class of Hungarians were exempt from almost every obligation of citizenship.

The great superiority of the modern over the mediæval State consists in this, that its authority is increased by the removal of the absolute immunity of particular classes and regions, and is limited by political boundaries. It extends its power over the whole nation, but not over the whole of its existence. No individual entirely escapes from it, none is subject to it in every thing. In all those things in which men are protected by their rights, that is, in which they owe duties to some authority distinct from that of the State—in the departments especially of property and conscience, in which men are bound to their Church and to their families and posterity—in matters, therefore, of divine worship, education, distribution of wealth, the State has no controlling power. It is in this system that freedom lies.

But there is a third theory, which not only subjects all classes and all places to the civil power, but also every phase and domain of social existence; in which men belong wholly to the State, and have no power over

themselves. This is the centralising, revolutionary despotism of the State, by which all things are rendered to Cæsar. It was the system of Joseph II. and Francis I. in Austria, whilst in Hungary the feudal system subsisted with all its imperfections. Against both of these opposite and contradictory evils a reaction has been carried on by the statesmen who governed the empire from the revolution to the Italian war; and they have been constantly opposed by the partisans of extremely antiquated notions, the so-called old conservatives, and by the liberal adherents of modern ideas.

The selection of the new governor deprives the concession which has been made with respect to the territorial distribution of the appearance of weakness. Benedek came out of the late calamitous campaign, like Todleben from the Crimean war, with the greatest increase of reputation of any general engaged in it. A circumstance, of which we can vouch for the truth, expressively denotes the estimation in which he is held by the Austrian army. At Melegnano, Benedek, who commanded in chief the division of which a part was engaged, visited the outposts, and was highly displeased with the arrangements of the general in command there. He instantly sent him to the rear, and obtained his disgrace at head-quarters. This officer, whom he had treated with such galling severity, speaking afterwards in his retirement of the events of the war, declared that Benedek was the only man fit to lead the Austrians, and that if he had been their leader, every soldier in the army would have felt confident that they would drive the French out of Italy. But in addition to his great military ability, the new governor of Hungary is well known for the severity, almost the brutality, of his manners. Under Radetsky, he was head of the staff of the second army in Italy. He was so unpopular in the country, that he was removed when a policy of conciliation was introduced. The concession is therefore accompanied by a distinct intimation that the government will go no farther, and has something of defiance about it.

# THE RAMBLER.

---

VOL. III. *New Series.*

JULY 1860.

PART VIII.

---

## THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

It is a happy thing for this country that constitutional questions are not settled by abstract argument, but by precedent and prescription. Abstract argument would always be seesawing between more or less plausible views of the origin and principles of our constitution, or floundering in the fathomless depths of the "rights of man;" whereas the argument from precedents, being dry and technical, tends to clear all passion from disputes, and being definite, tends to shorten the controversy and bring it to a tangible result. Yet no one can doubt that, if the argument from precedents were always honestly conducted, it would ever carry us exactly in the contrary direction to that which "the logic of facts" would lead us to take. It would give us a dead, pedantic, antiquarian constitution to deal with one of the most progressive of populations. But the argument from precedents, though it has always been the plea, has never been the *ultima ratio* of the settlement of the disputes between the two Houses of Parliament, or between the Parliament and the Crown. Instead of the ancient precedent guiding the modern practice, it has always been seen that the new prescription has in fact devoured the old, and novelties have been authenticated as immemorial usages. Most controversies have been in fact settled by the relative strength to which each party in the State had attained at the period. Charles I. might have brought forward a much more cogent *catena* of precedents for his prerogatives than the Commons in 1671 could bring for their sole rights in the matter of taxation. Yet the constitutional question was decided against Charles and in favour of the Commons; and if Parliament had reason besides force on its side in the former case, it is more than doubtful whether the Commons had any thing but the

law of the strongest on theirs in 1671. Our greatest constitutional historian, Hallam, records the following judgment on this chapter of our history :

“If the Commons, as in early times, had merely granted their own money, it would be reasonable that their House should have, as it claimed to have, ‘a fundamental right as to the matter, the measure, and the time.’ But that the peers, subject to the same burdens as the rest of the community, and possessing no trifling proportion of general wealth, should have no other alternative than to refuse the necessary supplies of the revenue, or to have their exact proportion, with all qualifications and circumstances attending their grant, presented to them unalterably by the other House of Parliament, was an anomaly that could hardly rest on any other ground of defence than such a series of precedents as establish a constitutional usage ; while, in fact, it could not be made out that such a pretension was ever advanced by the Commons before that parliament (1671).”

To insist upon adhering woodenly and rigidly to precedents and prescription, even when reason urges a contrary course, is to resolve that, “having once been wrong, we’ll be so still.” There are maxims of our constitution which are older and more sacred than any precedent, and among these maxims one of the chief is, that “the people taxes itself ;” it pays no more than it votes, and those upon whom the taxes fall determine their measure. One class does not tax another, but either each class taxes itself, or all together vote the taxes for the whole body. It was only to carry out this maxim in practice, and to guard it from being transgressed, that the Commons of England were from the earliest times so jealous of being taxed by any but themselves, whether by the king or by the Lords.

In the earliest periods of our constitutional history, the chief reason for the king’s summoning the Lords and the Commons was, that they might supply his necessities. This they did by separate grants, which they made without mutual communication ; and the Commons usually taxed themselves in a higher proportion than the Lords. Probably an attentive examination would discover in our history traces of the system which survived till our own day in Hungary, and till the French Revolution over great part of the Continent,—a system which throws all the burden of taxation on the middle and lower classes, and exempts the nobles from all contributions. A mediæval adage has come down to us, which says,

“*Deux-ace non possunt, et size-cinq solvere nolunt :*  
Est igitur notum *quatre-trey* solvere totum.”

If *size-cinq*, the nobles, will not pay, and *deuce-ace*, the lower

classes, cannot, then *quatre-trey*, the middle classes, must. Under these circumstances, it is easily seen that the struggle for liberty would resolve itself into the assertion of the right of self-taxation, and the most jealous carefulness on the part of the middle classes not to allow the nobility, with all its privileges and exemptions, to impose their taxes.\*

But if the Lords did not tax the Commons, the Commons, on the other hand, did not attempt to tax the Lords. Thus, 22d Edward III., the Commons granted three-fifteenths of their goods in such a manner as to show beyond a doubt that the tax was to be levied solely upon themselves. We cannot prove that the taxes imposed by the Commons were always exclusively levied upon themselves, though Hallam suspects that this was the case. "I have been almost led to suspect," he says, "by considering this remarkable exclusive privilege of originating grants of money to the Crown, as well as by the language of some passages in the rolls of Parliament relating to them, that *no part of the direct taxes*, the tenths or fifteenths of goods, were assessed upon the Lords temporal and spiritual, except when it is positively mentioned, which is frequently the case."

It may be asked, then, How is it that, under the altered circumstances, when Lords and Commons had alike become liable to the common periodical plague of the tax-gatherer's visits, the Commons still preserved their exclusive privileges? It may be replied, first, that the privilege of the Commons does not quite exclude all voice of the Lords; the Lords have a veto on any money Bill, though they have no power to alter. Moreover, they join with the Commons in passing the Bill; and grants are said to be made by both Lords and Commons. The Lords in 1671 produced the formula, "The Lords and Commons grant," as a proof that they had a right to amend money Bills. To which the Commons replied, "These words must either be understood *reddendo singula singulis*,—that is, the Lords grant for themselves, and the Commons grant for the counties, cities, and boroughs, whom they represent,"—or they are merely formal. But if the Lords had either represented large tax-paying communities, or had been large tax-payers themselves, the case would have been different, as the Commons implied when they said, "Your Lordships' proportion in all taxes, in comparison of what the commonalty pay, is very inconsiderable." In other words, though

\* It appears by a letter of Humboldt to Varnhagen, in June 1839, that it had been the opinion of the Austrian statesman Gentz, that "to save the fatherland means reinstating the Prussian nobility in its privileges, and leaving it untaxed, in order that after a short negotiation it may present to the monarch its *don gratuit*."

the Lords were acknowledged to have a real joint action in making grants, yet, as their share in the payment of these grants was very small, they were never allowed to take the initiative, or to play any thing but a very subordinate part in making them.

Another circumstance continued to make the Commons jealous of the interference of the Lords, long after the nobles had lost all their exclusive privileges. In early times the Lords' interests were almost identical with those of the king; and the House of Lords was intimately connected with the king's ordinary council, which sat among the peers, and had a deliberative voice, probably till the time of Edward III. Moreover, the position and wealth of the peers gave them great influence, often an intimidating ascendancy over many members of the House of Commons. Add to this the fact, that the king's prerogative of making new peers would always put it into his power to render the House of Lords a tool in his own hands, as was seen under the Stuarts. From 1450 to 1600 there had never been more than 54 temporal Lords. James I. summoned to his first parliament 82, and to his last 96; Charles I., in 1640, summoned 119; and Charles II., in 1661, summoned 139. Many of these peerages had been created solely to counteract the policy of opposition to the Court, which had begun to manifest itself among some of the nobility, and many had been the result of purchase. Hence had arisen a notorious jealousy between the two houses, which under the Commonwealth resulted in the total suppression of the House of Lords. This jealousy still smouldered in 1671, and no doubt lent an asperity to the dispute, and enabled the Commons to rely on the country for support in an extension of their privileges, which was neither sanctioned by precedent nor required by sound reasons.

But these jealousies, however they may have influenced the decision of 1671, were not capable of being reduced to pleas and arguments. The two grounds on which the Commons established their privileges against the Lords were: the non-representative character of the peers, and the comparatively small portion of the taxation which fell directly upon them. Now in deciding the present case of privilege, it becomes necessary to ask whether these arguments still remain as valid as they were in 1671. As for the first, Mr. Bright and his party assume that the question remains precisely as it did in 1671. The issue that he challenges is this, "Shall we submit to be taxed by an irresponsible body, or shall we hold fast to that constitutional maxim of our fathers which declared that taxation and representation should be inseparable." It is still



true that the aristocracy does not represent, that is, it does not represent technically and directly; for it is not elective. But the question now to be settled is, whether it has not a virtual representation. In 1671 there was no question of virtual representation; those classes which enjoyed the franchise at all were directly and really represented. In our enormously increased population, several classes have now to be contented with a merely indirect and virtual representation. For we must not forget that the law which gives the man who lives in a house assessed at 10*l.* an equal influence on the constitution with a man whose house is assessed at 100*l.*, has in fact taken away the direct representation of the higher classes of gentry in the House of Commons. It only requires the action of time and the increase of population to make the disfranchisement of these classes complete, directly and indirectly too. It is already ascertained that to give an equal weight to high and low in constituencies like the metropolitan, is practically to deprive the best classes of all representation. It is only in the less numerous and less homogeneous constituencies that the educated classes retain any power; and there it is not a legal power that can be securely counted upon, but only a more or less evanescent influence. The poorer classes acknowledge the influence of manner and bearing, and feel the nameless charm of refinement; and they accord personal confidence to a gentleman more easily than to one of their own order. But any one can see that the tenure of this influence is social, not political. A political feeling that seized the lower classes like an epidemic would discover to them that they have in their own hands, without any revolutionary measures, the tiller of the state.

Now when whole classes of men find that they are only indirectly represented, they must necessarily look on the representative system as something less definite and tangible than it was when they, as well as the other classes of the nation, had their own direct representatives secured to them by the letter of the law, as well as by their social influence. Where all representation is indirect, there any institution which secures the expression of the feelings, opinions, and interests of a certain class, is some real representation of that class. Now our position is, that even at present the House of Lords equally with the House of Commons has already become the indirect representative of the gentry, of the classes that pay income-tax, and that it must become more and more so with the increase of population, with the spread of knowledge and of organisation among the lower classes, and especially with the development of parliamentary

reform on the principles of 1832. The House of Lords, as a feudal council of the king's peers, representing no one but themselves, is completely out of date, and appears like an anomaly in our constitution. The House of Lords, as the virtually representative Chamber of the upper classes,—of all who in mediæval Latin would have been called *nobiles*, Anglicè gentlemen, of gentle blood,—may possibly have a grand future before it, as the necessary balance of a further reformed House of Commons.

The word *nobilis* was of much more extended signification than our English word 'nobility.' A *nobilis* was a king's man, or baron, who held his land directly from the Crown. All these barons had originally the same right of forming part of the king's council. But probably, in consequence of their numbers, this constitution of things had become impracticable in King John's days. Hence the new constitution of Magna Charta provided that they should be divided into two estates, making up together the king's council; the first estate, or the greater barons, to be summoned personally by king's writ; the second estate of the lesser barons to be summoned by the sheriffs, to give, not personal, but representative attendance; for with personal attendance they would have filled all the council chambers in London. The words of the great Charter are clear :

"In order to have a common council of the kingdom to assess aid, . . . we will cause to be summoned all archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and *greater barons* severally, by our letters sealed; and further, we will cause to be summoned generally by our sheriffs and bailiffs all those who hold of us in chief to come to us on a certain day."

Whatever definition we give of *greater barons*, it is clear that by the terms of the great Charter the right of a summons to the Parliament was inherent in every freeholder who held of the king in chief. The only distinction was whether they were to give personal or only representative attendance. And this was determined by no consideration of family or blood, but only by the greater or less amount of land held in fee, as we may infer from the uncertainty of the peerage in early times,—men being summoned as barons to one parliament, and not summoned to the next.

Hence the term *nobiles* belonged as truly to the second estate as to the first. When the boroughs were summoned to send burgesses to the second House, a new element was introduced—the people; and of these two, the lower nobility and the people, the House of Commons was said to be composed. Thus the Duke de Bouillon writes in 1596: "The

state of England is divided into three parts—the Church, the nobility, and the people: of these the parliament consists. Of the Church, the prelates alone have seats (of personal right); of the nobility, the barons alone, who are about sixty-four in number, and no more. The remainder of the Church and nobility vote with the people, and by representatives.” This distinction still survives in our knights of the shires, as contrasted with the burgesses of the boroughs.

We must of course make allowances for the change of our constitution from that of a feudal state to its present mixed form. The names remain, but the things are only virtually or representatively the same. The barons or peers are no longer those who hold territorial baronies, neither are the *nobiles* any longer those who hold in chief of the king. Nobility and gentry still exist, but their definition is changed. Whether the House of Lords has any right to change or not, it has changed, and from a council of territorial lords and magistrates, each with power of “high, middle, and low” justice in his own domain, it has become a Chamber of hereditary legislators, who only accidentally, or by a continual exercise of the royal prerogative in creating new peers, happen to belong to the wealthiest and most powerful families in the kingdom. In the same way the lower nobility or gentry have changed; their definition is no longer by their domains, but by their education or their wealth. The income-tax as a test has succeeded to the freehold test, and the present peers have precisely the same relation to the payers of income-tax as the greater barons of old had to the freeholders.

But in their relations with the “people,” the gentry by no means hold the same place which they formerly occupied. The popular or democratic element long ago succeeded in inserting the little end of the wedge, and has been ever since occupied in driving it home; so that the gentry can no longer count upon their old preponderance in the House of Commons; hitherto they have indirectly, by influence and by the momentum of their former speed, retained much of their power. But their tenure is manifestly insecure, and they subsist partly on the ignorance, partly on the good-nature of their rivals; elbowed, or in process of being elbowed, out of the House of Commons, their prospects are not much better in the Upper House, so long as the representative system is altogether repudiated by the peers.

And yet it is only on the ground of their being virtually a representative body that the peers are at all likely to maintain the privilege they have so boldly asserted. If they sit

and vote in Parliament simply for themselves, then, notwithstanding their vast increase in numbers, the share of the national burdens borne by the 410 temporal peers who now have seats is probably not so great, certainly not greater, when compared with the wealth of the other classes of the empire, than was the share of the burdens borne by the 150 peers in 1671, whose proportion was said to be "very inconsiderable," and who were therefore prohibited from making the slightest modification in money Bills.

The case, then, seems to us to stand thus: if the peers may prevent the Commons repealing a tax, they are to have the power of continuing a tax, and therefore virtually the power of taxation; if this, which certainly would not have been permitted in 1671, is to be allowed in 1860, the reason must be that the circumstances of the nation are so changed as to deprive the arguments relied upon by the Commons two centuries ago of their force. The peers must now be considered to represent (indirectly of course) certain classes whose representation in the Commons is either inadequate or insecure; and by virtue of this representation, the proportion of fiscal burdens which they and their constituents bear must now entitle them to join in settling the taxation, if they are to be considered so entitled.

We have, then, on one side the upper classes gradually losing their direct and secure representative preponderance in the Commons; on the other, we have the Lords asserting a privilege which, on the principles of the last two centuries, can only belong to them on the supposition that they are virtually a representative body. Do not these two facts suggest the congruity of developing this element in the Lords? And what could be a greater bulwark for the peers against the democratical attack on their very existence which is looming in no very distant future, than to make them, or part of them, the real and direct representatives of the English gentry, and in virtue of this representation to restore to them a coördinate power of settling the taxes with the Commons?

We are quite aware that it is simply Utopian to expect that the peers will voluntarily agree to any thing that looks like a reform of their House or order. They consider that they are the constant element in our constitution, and that they have no right to change. The vigour with which they resisted the creation of life-peerages is still fresh in our memory. Yet they have changed with the times, and most certainly will change again. At first all peerages were territorial; every one who held a barony of the king, that is, a territorial estate for which the holder paid 100 marks of

yearly relief, was entitled, at the discretion of the king, to be summoned by writ as a baron. The king had no right to summon any man whose property was too small for the honour. The honour followed the property, as the earldom of Arundel follows the possession of Arundel Castle, and as the possessor of Berkeley Castle claims the barony as attached to the estate.

Richard II. was the first to introduce the present practice of making the title and the seat in Parliament a personal honour, descending in fee-tail male, instead of going to the heirs general with the property. This was a real revolution; before this the House of Lords was necessarily the representative of the wealth of the country. Since the new principle was established, it may any day happen, and must some day happen, to all noble families, that the property goes one way and the honours another, and that the peerage is left without sufficient funds to support the dignity. The nearest modern equivalent to the peerage as it existed before Richard II. would be, we imagine, if the Queen was able at her discretion to summon to each parliament all or any of those who yearly paid more than a given large sum in direct taxes: the summons, unless it was renewed, giving no permanent title, and even if it was renewed, the title not necessarily passing to the man's heir. We are not advocating such a measure; we only put the imaginary case to show how great has been the change, and how different is the reality from what analogy might have led us to expect.

Another great change is in the very matter upon which the present question hinges. The Lords had originally a voice in money Bills; and by the principle that all who pay taxes have a right to a voice in their imposition, they should still have it. Yet they were gradually excluded from this privilege, and, stranger still, they acquiesced in their exclusion.

The suppression of the monasteries was another revolution in the House of Lords. By that measure the clergy lost about thirty-six votes; these, added to the twenty-two bishops, gave the ecclesiastics a clear majority over the temporal peers, whose number under Henry VIII. was never greater than fifty-one.

In 1719 the Lords themselves attempted a revolution still more serious. A Bill was introduced, and read twice in the House of Lords without a division, "to settle and limit the peerage in such a manner that the number of English peers should not be enlarged beyond six of the present number, which, upon failure of issue male, might be supplied by new creations; that instead of the sixteen elective peers from Scotland, twenty-five should be made hereditary in that part

of the kingdom ; and that this number, upon failure of heirs male, should be supplied from the other members of the Scotch peerage." Thus the Crown was to be deprived of the prerogative of creating peers at will ; for it was thought that if succeeding monarchs were to follow the example of Queen Anne, and create a dozen peers at a batch, there could be no security as to the principles or votes of the House of Lords. We have seen in our own day an example of this, when the Lords were intimidated into passing the Reform Bill of 1832 by the threat of the ministry to create as many new peers as would give the liberals a majority in the House.

Another attempt to change the character of the Upper House has been recently made, and defeated by the Lords. Lord Palmerston attempted to reform the abuse of drafting whole sections of the upper classes into an hereditary peerage (for this is the practical result of the present facility of creating peers) by raising the law-lords to life-peerages. In introducing his reform, he neither declared its limits, nor argued its necessity ; but he dwarfed his object into the concoction of a mere technical court of appeal, and rested on some precedent raked out of the annals of one of the Plantagenets. If he failed, it by no means follows that the question of life-peerages is yet settled.

There are, therefore, precedents and possibilities of change in the constitution of the House of Lords. Neither are there wanting elements on which these latent forces may act : the principle of representation is an instance. It is sometimes said that there is nothing representative in the House of Lords. This is scarcely true ; for though the constituents represented are only the Scotch and Irish peers, yet the admission of the principle of representation evidently affords an entrance to a further development of it ; especially when the constituencies represented have notoriously become mere rotten boroughs that cry out aloud for reform.

At the time of the union with Scotland there were 157 Scotch peers ; it was agreed that these should be represented by 16, elected for each parliament, in the English House of Lords. At first the terms of the union were interpreted to mean that no Scotch peer, created a British peer subsequently to the union, could take his seat as such, but that the 16 representative peers covered the whole Scotch peerage. This rule held good from 1711 to 1782, when the Lords gave way, and have been since flooded with Scoto-British peers. The number of Scotch peers has diminished to 82 ; these now not only send their 16 direct representatives to the House of Lords, but are also indirectly represented by 41 more who

sit as British peers, and by a very large number of Scotch commoners who have been created British peers since the union; so that we now have some 60 Scoto-British peers in the House, besides the 16 representatives.

By the terms of the Irish union 28 peers are elected for life to represent the Irish peerage. In 1801 there were 224 Irish, of whom 46 were also British peers; now the number is 194, of whom 74 are also in the British peerage. Thus, in 1801, a constituency of 178 returned 28 direct and 46 indirect representatives; now a constituency of 120 has 28 direct and 74 indirect representatives. Clearly, if the terms of the union were fair, the present influence of the Irish and Scotch peerage in the House is excessive, and their representative peers might be fairly taken from them. In such a case, what objection would there be to extending the constituencies of these 44 elective peers so as to make them the representatives, not of their present close boroughs, but of all the untitled aristocracy and wealth of the three kingdoms? And would not this extension be the very title-deed and diploma of the privileges which they are now bent upon maintaining?

Such a development would be consonant to the analogies of our history. By the terms of the great Charter there are two houses of *nobiles*: the one personal, consisting of the earls and greater barons; the other elective, consisting of the representatives of the smaller barons or knights and freeholders. To these was added in after times a third estate,—the trading class, or people; but as they were added gradually, they had not a house apart, but sat and voted in the representative chamber of the *nobiles*. The untitled aristocracy preserved their legal preponderance in the Lower House till 1832, when the Reform Bill gave the direct power to the upper strata of the estate of the “people.” With the progress of reform it seems clear that the untitled aristocracy will gradually lose, not only their direct and legal preponderance, but also the indirect influence which they have as yet triumphantly maintained. The question therefore suggests itself, whether some gentle and gradual alteration in the distribution of the three estates among the two Houses is not possible—whether we might not find some small place for the untitled aristocracy in the Upper House, when they are being squeezed and elbowed out of the Lower House by the advancing tide of the democracy? It would seem to be a just balance to any lowering of the franchise for the election of members of the House of Commons, that the virtually disfranchised portion of the upper classes should have some few direct representatives in the Upper House, and that the Lords should in

consequence be permitted to resume their coördinate power in the imposition of taxes.

It would be easy to draw out a definite plan for the development or creation of the representative system in the Lords; but it would be childish to do so till the preliminary question is settled—whether directly or indirectly, potentially or actually, there is in the Upper House any element which is, or which ought to be, or which can easily be made to be, representative of any other class of constituents than the actual titled aristocracy. We know full well that it is a constitutional heresy to maintain the representative character of the Lords. Lord Shelburne once asserted it in his place in Parliament to Burke's indignation. But Church and State differ in this, that in the latter heresies may in time come round to be orthodox doctrines; for only constant facts can be described in unchanging formulas.

A much greater heresy would be to draw too trenchant a line between the two Houses. Nothing would be easier than to push our argument to a most mischievous excess in this direction. It is therefore necessary to protest, that as we have no desire, so we have no expectation, of seeing the upper classes totally excluded from the Commons, and gaining in compensation a representative voice in the Lords, so that the Upper House should become the exclusive representative of the aristocracy,—of birth, wealth, and education,—and the Lower House that of trade and labour. The present temperament is best, where the upper classes as well as, or even more than, the lower classes are represented in the Commons, though neither the peers nor the poorest classes have the franchise. In a representative chamber no class can be safely excluded, as Guizot found to his cost. And the merit of Lord John Russell's measure of Reform is, that he wishes to enfranchise a portion of the labouring class, so that no common interest will be without its direct representation in the Commons. We applaud his purpose, but we distrust his means.

It seems probable that any universal and homogeneous measure of Reform will either give the newly-enfranchised classes power everywhere, or power nowhere. If nowhere, the measure is futile; if everywhere, it is revolutionary. It may be said that the actual variety in the circumstances of those whose holdings are rated at 6*l.* in different boroughs provides for the necessary differentiation, and thus for the actual and direct representation of all classes. But it must be remembered that every where and universally the immense majority of voters will be those whose holdings are rated



under 15*l.* annually, and that their preponderance will be the virtual disfranchisement of the whole class of gentry. Doubtless there will be differences in the remainder; when all the mountains are levelled, there may still remain undulations in the plain. But these trifling differences in elevation are no better representatives of the differentiated constituencies of old times, than, in the eyes of the tourist, the steepest gradients of a railway, or the occasional views from a viaduct, make up for the long hills and the extensive prospects of the old coach-road.

Thus between an exclusive House of Lords and a democratic House of Commons, the real aristocracy of the kingdom would be nowhere. The most important common interest of the country would be gradually eliminated from all share in the government. Those who would bear nearly the whole burden of the taxation, which a reformed House of Commons would try to make direct instead of indirect, would have no share in its imposition or in its management. Both for its own sake and for the sake of this disfranchised class, we think that the House of Lords, without any detriment to its true historical and prescriptive character, might advantageously open its doors, and develop some of the latent principles of its organisation. It seems to us the only plan by which the growing distance between the two Houses can be bridged over. The gentry is at present the link between them; as this link becomes less firmly imbedded in the Commons, the eliminated portion should find a new bed in the Lords, or its extrusion from one will only serve to push the other House further away. And no one can blink the danger of drawing the line of separation between the two Houses too strongly and clearly. The antagonism ought always to be broken by the admission of an element of each in the other; and though under no circumstances can we imagine that the gentry will ever be entirely unrepresented in the Commons, yet we desire to see that, as their influence dwindles there, it may increase in another place, so as to keep the link between the Houses up to the required mark of efficiency and strength. In favouring such a wish, the titled aristocracy would enlist the great bulk of the present payers of direct taxation on its side; for it would attract the sympathies of all who fear lest in course of time, and with a reformed House of Commons, the lower classes will impose, and the upper will only pay, the taxes, unless some coördinate and controlling power can be secured to the Upper House.

## HEFELE'S LIFE OF XIMENES.\*

PROFESSOR HEFELE of Tübingen has acquired by his excellent History of the Councils a very great name in the ecclesiastical literature of our time. His *Life of Ximenes*, though a clever and successful work, is not distinguished by the same profound research, and it does not possess the advantage of manuscript information, which gives a real value to all the writings of Prescott. Though it is unquestionably the best history of the great Cardinal, the popularity it has acquired is probably chiefly due to the critique of Llorente's History of the Inquisition. Even on this subject, however, it brings to light no new matter, and repeats with great point and fulness, but little addition, much that has been often urged before. The author has not entirely escaped that partial and argumentative tone of apology and advocacy which was during the last generation so common among Catholic historians, and which sanctioned and almost justified the method of the Protestant and infidel writers, whose conclusions they questioned, and not unfrequently disproved. This may perhaps be attributed partly to the insidious influence which biography exercises over those who write it. For that most entertaining branch of literature is also the most apt to distort the facts and proportions of history, by the interest with which the hero inspires his biographer. For a person is more attractive than a principle, and an impartial biography is far more rare than an impartial history. In proportion as a cause is bad in itself, it becomes necessary to exalt those who are its representatives. This is one great reason of that unfairness of Protestant writers which is often unjustly attributed to hatred of the Catholic Church. A reforming party cannot admit that those who instituted the reformation were not really better than those who rejected it. It is unreasonable to expect of a zealous Protestant that he will give up the characters of his leaders, or recognise the superiority of Catholic heroes. Infidels and rationalists are not so bound. They do not look for authorities. They depend on themselves, and make their own subjective consciousness the supreme test of truth. Their case does not stand upon the merits of any set of men, and they may be perfectly disinterested in all disputes regarding persons. Indeed, their attention is more particularly directed to the impersonal

\* *The Life of Cardinal Ximenes*. By Dr. von Hefele; translated from the German by the Rev. Canon Dalton. Catholic Publishing Company, 1860.

forces in history, and it is in this way that they have erected the philosophy of history into a scientific system of laws. For this reason also they are so often astonishingly fair and favourable in their judgment upon men whom it has been a Protestant tradition to denounce. In many particulars their views approach very nearly to those of Catholics, and their method of investigation is more Catholic than their results often are. They have made the progress of learning independent of the interests of parties, and by this means have rendered the greatest service to the Church. Unfortunately we ourselves have not escaped the influence of Protestant examples. We too often think that the cause of our religion is at stake in the vindication of some great character, and degrade what is divine to the level of human weakness. We do not keep sufficiently distinct the purposes of edification and of scientific research; consequently our interests are often safer in the keeping of others than in our own.

At any rate, Canon Dalton deserves our thanks for bringing this work within reach of English readers. He has been assisted by a German gentleman, who will be able to be of great use in introducing us to the Catholic literature of his country, when he has succeeded in acquiring greater correctness and facility of language. Canon Dalton has brought to bear upon the undertaking a great love for the subject, knowledge of foreign literature, zeal for the cause of religion, some acquaintance with several Spanish books that were not known to Hefele, and some gleanings from the literary gossip of Valladolid. His greatest merit is a perfectly disinterested and good-humoured love of truth—at all times a rare possession. It frequently appears in the Introduction, and in the notes he has appended to the work. When, for instance, Hefele says that when the Council of Toledo decreed the expulsion of the Jews, in consequence of their having conspired against the state, it was intended only to banish those who had actually joined in the treason, his translator gives an extract in a note to show that in fact all were banished. It is equally characteristic of his notions of historical science, that he attempts to control Hefele's statement by quoting in Spanish the text of a council of the seventh century; or that he concludes that the older Spanish writers "had better means of appreciating the character" of Torquemada than Mr. Prescott, *because* "they speak of him with the highest respect." But in spite of such defects as these, the simplicity and sincerity of his remarks oblige us to overlook the claims of strict criticism in admiration of the great scenes he has brought once more before us.

In the Introduction Mr. Dalton endeavours to modify Hefele's view of the political origin and purpose of the Inquisition. We will not say that he proves his case; but at the same time this portion of the original is so very defective, that we will join the translator in his attempt to improve and to correct it. Any discussion of the subject must, however, be considered premature, whilst a work which has long been in preparation by a laborious Frenchman, Mr. Du Boys, who has occasionally contributed some fragments to the *Catholic Reviews*, remains unpublished.

It is in reality an idle inquiry whether the most powerful and characteristic of the national institutions of Spain owed its establishment to political or religious considerations, for at that time they were nearly identical in Spain. The existence from the first of a political element is manifest from the fact that the old Inquisition still subsisted in Aragon at the time when the new one was introduced, and had frequently taken cognisance of those religious transgressions against which the new tribunal was peculiarly directed. If, therefore, religious motives had alone prevailed, it would have been enough to extend the inquisition of Aragon to the kingdom of Castile. This was not done, simply because a purely ecclesiastical tribunal would not have served the purpose of the Catholic kings. The new inquisition was, in fact, more particularly wanted against the *Maranos* of Aragon. But it was first introduced in Castile because it was thought that the liberties of the Aragonese would put some obstacle in the way. There is no doubt, however, that Hefele, following the lead of De Maistre, a most seductive but unsafe guide in matters of history, has exaggerated the extent to which purely political motives influenced the Spanish sovereigns. The character of the tribunal became afterwards chiefly secular; and the royal power, not the Church, derived the chief profit from its existence. But that advantage was obtained in an almost equal degree during the earlier period, when its whole constitution and action were entirely ecclesiastical. For there is no greater auxiliary of absolute power than the presence in the state of an oppressed religious body; and no government is more powerful than one in whom the people behold its vigilant guardian against an enemy of its religion. Tyrants, says Herrera, always cover themselves with the mantle of religion.\* It was in their capacity of defenders of the faith, by virtue, therefore, of the tribunal by which they fulfilled that duty, that the kings of Spain, even at the time

\* "Todos los tiranos se cubren siempre con el manto de la religion." *Hist. de la Indias occid.* dec. v. lib. iii. cap. 8.

of their worst misgovernment, retained the obedience and the love of their subjects. Thus, in 1770, Burke, instituting a comparison between the revenue of George III., which, including a civil list of 800,000*l.*, he estimated at more than a million, and the ostensible expenses of the court, affirmed that the greater portion of it served to increase, by means of corruption, the unconstitutional power of the crown. But a larger sum than that which at the close of the eighteenth century seemed dangerous to the liberties of the nation, was drawn at the beginning of the seventeenth century, by our most despotic king, from the Catholic ransom. It would not be difficult to show that the rise of the system of penal laws coincided with the excessive growth of the monarchical power in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and its decline with the progress of political freedom in the eighteenth and the nineteenth, when the strongest resistance to Catholic emancipation was offered by the crown. In Spain, in like manner, the king owed his great power to his zeal for religion; and the provision for defending the one inevitably promoted the other. The existence of the State had depended for centuries upon its resistance to hostile religions; and the vigour with which the Inquisition pursued heretics, infidels, and Jews, had its origin in the danger which at different times the State encountered from all three. The Spanish monarchy was first securely established by the victory of Catholicism over Arianism. The victory over the Moors of Granada was the commencement of its unparalleled ascendancy in the affairs of Europe. After waging almost incessantly for 700 years a holy war for their hearths and homes, the Spaniards commenced in the fifteenth century a crusade against the Reformation. They grew accustomed to consider national interests identical with religious, and never understood that their religious wars were exhausting the country, or that the absolutism of the crown, which was their pride, was degrading the Church at home. Their zeal for the faith made them blind to the ruin of the State, and their patriotism concealed from them the disastrous condition of the Church. The time came when the danger of heresy had passed away, and the Inquisition, as a religious tribunal, had done its work. Then the political element which had lurked in it from the beginning survived alone, and absorbed the whole activity of the tribunal. Its constitution was not altered, and it served the State in the same way that it had seemed to serve the Church. In the eyes of a Spaniard of true blood there was no difference in principle between the crime of the relapsed Jew who was burned by Torquemada, and that of

the smuggler who was denounced to the Holy Office under the Bourbons.

The religious intolerance of which the Inquisition is the most striking expression holds a conspicuous place in the history of Spain, from the time of its conquest by the Arian Visigoths. There, as well as in Italy and in southern Gaul, the Gothic kings found that their dominion was uncertain and precarious so long as a barrier of religious animosity separated the conquerors from the natives. The national hostility of the Roman people would have been overcome in time by intermarriage, and by the superiority of the government of the Goths to that of the emperor, who was hardly less an alien than they. This superiority was so strongly felt, that the conquest seemed to many a deliverance—*ut inveniantur quidam Romani qui malint inter barbaros pauperem libertatem quam inter Romanos tributariam sollicitudinem sustinere*.<sup>\*</sup> But whilst Arianism was the religion of the Gothic state, and Catholicism that of the Roman nation, a durable union was impossible. The religious question determined the existence of all the new kingdoms. The immediate conversion of the Franks from the worship of Odin to the religion of the people at once rendered the monarchy of the Merovingians the most stable and the most powerful of all the Teutonic conquests. The fate of the Goths in Italy was equally significant. Though founded and governed by the wisest and ablest chief who appeared in the age of the great migration, their monarchy never took root among the people in consequence of their Arianism, and was completely and speedily destroyed. Theodoric sought to avoid every occasion of discontent. He gave the Romans their own laws and liberties, and sought to destroy neither the religion nor the institutions of imperial Italy. This very tolerance was fatal to his throne. His people remained strangers in the land. They formed a separate state, governed by its own laws, and supported by its own power, without the help or the sympathy of the Italians; and they were compelled to meet the armies of Justinian in the midst of the ill-will of the people they had delivered.

The lesson of contemporary history was not lost upon the Gothic kings in Spain, where there was every sign that the same causes would produce like results. It became the first maxim of their policy that their power could be consolidated only through the union in the same religion of the dominant and the subject races. Naturally they strove to impose their own belief upon the people. For all the Goths clung with

<sup>\*</sup> Orosius, vii. 33.

a strange tenacity to the form in which they had first known Christianity. For this the Ostrogoths were exterminated; and the Visigoths did not yield until it had cost them Aquitaine, and threatened to ruin their power in the Peninsula. The adoption of Arianism by the Spanish people would confirm the supremacy of the ruling race, and would break off for ever the connection between their subjects and the Catholic empire. Unity and independence seemed alike to call for the predominance of the Arian faith; accordingly Lewigild set about converting the Catholic Spaniards. First he tried conciliation. An Arian synod at Toledo abolished the practice of rebaptising the Catholics who joined the Arian communion. When it was found that this concession was ineffectual, severer means were adopted, and a persecution commenced, which led to a partial apostasy, but ended in a civil war. Warned by his example, his son and successor Recared sought the same political results in another policy. Whilst his father had provoked an armed resistance in attempting to force Arianism upon the Spaniards, Recared found that there was no resistance and no difficulty in converting all the Arians to Catholicism. The danger of religious differences had nowhere been more keenly felt, and was nowhere more deeply feared, than in Spain; and the preservation of religious unity became a political principle, to which, in almost every age, the most stupendous sacrifices continued to be made, and were made in vain.

The Jews form the connecting link between the intolerance of the Goths and that of the later Inquisition, and they contributed more than any other religious party to its introduction. Their persecutions had begun at the conversion of Recared, when the principle of religious unity was first made a law of the State. At that time they were already numerous, and began to consider Spain as a new land of promise, and the scene of their future greatness. Under the Moors, these hopes were partly realised. Cordova, Granada, Toledo, says the greatest of their modern historians, sound like home and household names to a Jewish ear, as much as Jerusalem or Tiberias. They asserted that they had been settled in the country ever since the days of Solomon, in order to prove that they had no part in the death of Christ. Previous to the Teutonic invasion they were not molested. The Theodosian code only forbids them to possess Christian slaves, or to build new synagogues, and to hold judicial or military offices. Under the Arian Goths they retained their own laws. At Naples they exhibited their gratitude by defending the city against Belisarius. At Rome

the people plundered their houses and burnt their synagogue, in order to spite their protector Theodoric.

In Spain the Jews and Christians lived on the best terms together. They frequently intermarried ; and one of the first Spanish Councils had occasion to forbid the faithful to allow their crops to be blessed by Jews. Christian slaves were common in Jewish houses. It is remarkable how little abhorrence of the Jews was manifested by the Christians in the age which immediately followed their crime, and when the remembrance of the terrible expiation under Titus and Hadrian was fresh in all men's minds. The germs of an altered feeling were laid during the Arian ascendancy. The Goths protected and preferred the Jews. They were more highly civilised, more adapted to civil offices, than the Goths themselves, and they were not by their religion, like the Catholics, natural allies of the Emperor. Whilst the Goths and the Spaniards were governed by their separate laws, the Jews were often admitted to authority over the Spaniards, but never over the Goths. The restrictions imposed upon them by the Roman law were no longer enforced ; consequently the evils which those restrictions had been designed to prevent began to spread, and at the conversion of the Goths a reaction ensued which aimed at first only at the restoration of the Theodosian law. The Council of Toledo, under Recared, at once decreed that they should not hold civil offices, *per quæ eis occasio tribuatur pœnam Christianis inferre*. They were not to have Christian wives, and the children of mixed marriages were to be baptised. The most important point was, that they were forbidden to have Christian slaves. Under the empire the law obliged them to purchase heathen slaves wherever they could be got, and it sometimes happened that a slave, to escape from a Jewish master, professed to have been a Christian. As the Goths did not enforce the Theodosian decree, it became more and more common for Christians to be made the slaves of Jews. Now it was particularly offensive to a Jew to have in his house persons who did not obey his ceremonial law ; and the Talmud ordained that the slaves should either be circumcised or sold again. This was a great danger and injury to religion, and it is due to the intolerance of the Jews themselves that the first oppressive measures were adopted against them. It has never been their practice to modify their regulations so as to make them more palatable to the Christians. Not many years ago, when the removal of their civil disabilities was being debated in several European Parliaments, one of their most eminent writers urged in vain the abrogation of that precept by which



it is made lawful to cheat a Christian. So it was in Spain in the seventh century. It was morally impossible for a Jew to permit his Christian slaves to profess their own religion. It was materially impossible for him to exist without slaves. Heathens could no longer be got. So long as the Jews were Jews, it seemed that the Catholic faith would be constantly exposed to a great profanation and injury. Something required to be done. Then, in the first moment of the victory over Arianism, in the midst of the strong political reaction towards religious unity, a measure was resolved upon which has thrown a gloom over the whole history of Spain, which proved in its results injurious to the Church, pernicious to the State, and which was the real cause of the establishment of the Inquisition, and of the consequences which ensued. King Sisebut, in the year 612, decreed that all the Jews who did not consent to be baptised should leave the country before a certain date. Many preferred exile to apostasy. A large number remained, and were baptised. It is evident that the government imagined that Judaism could be as easily renounced as Arianism, and that they had no conception of its vitality, or of the vigour of the Jewish belief. St. Isidore censured the act of the king: *emulationem quidem Dei habuit, sed non secundum scientiam*; but it was supposed that even if those who had been converted by violence should never become sincere Christians, their errors would not be inherited by their children.\* The great evil of the measure lay in the success which partly attended it.

A few years later the law of Sisebut was repealed, the exiles returned, and the converts relapsed. In the year 633, at a council at Toledo, in which Isidore of Seville was the leading mind, it was determined that the Jews were not to be converted by force or by threats, but that those who had once been baptised could not be permitted to return to their old errors. Those who persisted were to be reduced to slavery. Henceforward they continued to be regarded as heretics and apostates, and no relaxation of the severities against the Jews brought any relief to them. The government could not escape from the terrible consequences of the first compulsory conversion, by which an element of unbelief and hypocrisy was introduced into the Church, which she could neither crush nor cast out. The establishment of the Spanish Inquisition was a last desperate effort to remedy the conse-

\* "Nec hoc inutiliter facimus, si pro levandis pensionum oneribus eos ad Christi gratiam perducamus, quia etsi ipsi minus fideliter veniunt, hi tamen qui de eis nati fuerint jam fidelius baptizantur." *Gregory the Great*, Epist. v. 8.

quences of that fatal measure. It was the last practical development of the system inaugurated by the councils of Toledo against a danger from which the Church of Spain had never ceased to suffer, and which she never ceased to combat. A learned Jewish historian says: "The real necessity and possibility of such a tribunal lay simply in the dread of the gigantic influence of the converted Jews in society and religion. However we may curse the names of those on whom lie the tears and the blood of thousands of innocent men, one thing excuses them—that what they desired to extirpate had struck such deep root that it could be removed only by the greatest energy and exemplary severity." At first the Jews themselves felt no evil consequences from the Inquisition. Six years after its introduction Abarbanel was holding high financial office; and in his introduction to his commentary on the Book of Kings, he describes the condition of his people as in no way worse than before. There was so little fanaticism in the popular mind against them, that when Philip the Fair died, his death was attributed to the part he had taken in their expulsion. But the presence of the Jews was incompatible with the real conversion of the *conversos*. It was only by isolation that these could be made to surrender their practices, and that the influence of their religion could be neutralised. The Inquisition had a hopeless task with the relapsed, so long as the real Jews were tolerated. Therefore, as soon as the Moors were expelled from Granada, Ferdinand resolved that the Jews should either follow them or receive baptism. As the first persecution had followed immediately on the defeat of Arianism, the prospect of perfect unity opened by the fall of Granada led to a new attempt to coerce them. Accordingly it was decreed that all who refused baptism should leave Spain, and that they should take no coined money with them. The menace of confiscation added to that of exile would, it was expected, prove irresistible; and people were so little prepared for the great emigration that ensued, that alarm was expressed, not at the loss which the country would suffer by the execution of the decree, but at the danger to the purity of the Spanish blood from intermarriage with so many converted Jews.\* Nevertheless, 300,000 Jews went into poverty and exile. In all matters relating to the Jews Hefe is very unsatisfactory, as he has neglected to make use of Jewish authorities. But there is no country in which

\* "No agradó á algunos este mandato de los reyes, por lo que ellos sospechaban, y especialmente por la mucha mezcla que á la nobleza d'Espana avian de causar con sus casamientos." *Garibay, Compendio Historial*, lib. xix. cap. 1.

they played a more important part than Spain, and nowhere is so much information to be obtained for national history from their writings. It is, however, a source that has been little explored by Christian writers.

Another most important part of the history of the Inquisition into which he has failed to inquire, is its position in the Church. It was the great barrier to the exercise of the Papal authority in Spain, and practically secured to the crown all the power which in France was aimed at by the Gallican system. The manner in which the rights of the Holy See were appropriated by means of it, and the contests between the court of Rome and the Spanish government on questions of jurisdiction,\* may be found in the works of the Spanish canonists. It appears to us that this is the portion of the history of the Inquisition by which most light may yet be thrown upon its character, and its influence on the destinies of Spain; all the information given on this topic by our author consists in an extract from Ranke's *Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*.†

It will be found that it was most injurious to the Church, whom it was its mission to protect. No other ecclesiastical institution was ever so completely exempt from the Papal jurisdiction; none ever formed so great an anomaly in the hierarchical system. It interposed between the Holy See and the Bishops, and between the Bishops and their flocks. It interrupted the connection between the religious orders and their generals in Rome, so that they degenerated, and came, in the eighteenth century, to be less respected than the secular clergy. In the sphere of doctrine its action was not more beneficial than in the domain of government. It has long been usual to palliate its many defects by saying that at least it saved Spain from heresy, and from the calamities of religious war. This is not true, and it is doubtful praise if it were true. If there had been any Protestant tendencies in Spain, there would have been some symptoms of opposition and resistance to the tribunal which was particularly vigilant against heresy. But instead of that, it was always a popular institution. Moreover, the control exercised over theological and historical literature would have made it impossible to meet Protestantism in open combat and controversy. But there never was any serious danger from

\* Louville, who was in Spain at the time of the accession of the Bourbons, speaks of the Inquisition as "toujours en guerre, au dehors avec le pape, au dedans avec les sujets" (*Mémoires secrets*, 1813, i. 69).

† This is one of Ranke's most remarkable works. Mr. Prescott thought so highly of it, that he caused a few copies of the translation to be printed in large type, for his own private use.

Protestantism which would not have been encountered with as much success if there had been no Inquisition. The recent history of Spain, as of Italy, makes it doubtful whether it is greatly for the advantage of a Catholic nation that it escaped the ordeal of the Reformation; whether to prevent a crisis is not to make the action of the poison more prolonged and more insidious, to convert an acute into a chronic disease, and make it impossible to overcome and cast out the danger. The means taken to resist Protestantism opened the way for infidelity. The Inquisition tried to prevent a conflict, not to prepare for it; and this policy, which was successful so long as a conflict could be avoided, made resistance almost impossible when it became necessary. The postponement of the religious controversy in Spain from the Protestant to the infidel period, rendered it in every way more difficult and more dangerous. That is not due to the Inquisition alone; but the Inquisition is responsible for the means which were employed for the purpose.

Of these the most efficacious and the most injurious was the system of intellectual repression. Not only was the Spanish Index far more comprehensive than the Roman, but it was conducted on a different principle. The Roman practice was, to point out the danger, and to caution men against it. The denunciation presupposed the intellectual confutation of the error, and was based upon it. It was understood that there was a class of learned men whose business it was to take cognisance, in the interest of orthodoxy, of the literary movement of the age, and to profit alike by its good and bad elements, whilst the generality of the faithful were excluded from this arena. Thus it was imagined that religion would have all the advantages both of security and of controversial exercise. But in Spain the dread of error was so great that it led to a fear of all mental activity. Literature was sacrificed to religion. Because faith might be imperilled by science, science was proscribed; and a system of stagnation was introduced, by which the Church was deprived of the aid which literature affords to her. The greatest severity was exercised upon every branch of ecclesiastical learning. The Spanish intellect, it is true, is not remarkable for versatility or comprehensiveness. There are departments for which Spaniards have never exhibited the smallest aptitude. When we speak of Spanish literature, we think generally of great poets like Cervantes and Calderon, or of great divines like those who did so much of the work of the Council of Trent. But at the revival of letters, it had seemed for a moment that Spain was to rival Italy on a far

wider field. Of the Oriental studies of Alcalà we hear something in the *Life of Ximenes*. Ancient learning had brilliant representatives in Vives and Augustinus. Throughout the sixteenth century there were great scholastic divines, and great mystical writers; and the Spanish historians, from Zurita to Mariana, rivalled the Florentines. But all this splendour faded quickly away; and when in Italy, France, and England, learning began to be more sound and literature more rich, in Spain they were already nearly extinct. After the beginning of the seventeenth century no great works appeared on ecclesiastical or pagan antiquities, on metaphysics or natural science. Even those branches of divinity which had most flourished in Spain, flourished but a short time. No history was cultivated but their own. In philosophy, antiquities, and natural science, Spain has the lowest place among the great nations of Europe. All this destruction the Inquisition wrought in a very short space. For the first half century it had little to do with literature, and literature accordingly flourished. Its attention began to be given to it when the Reformation called for some measures of resistance. Between the middle of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, during the reigns of Philip II. and Philip III., the whole intellectual movement of Spain was entirely crushed. Each branch of letters suffered in proportion as it was most nearly allied with religion, and most capable of serving it. Nothing survived intact but poetry and romance.

This is the great injury that the Inquisition inflicted on religion. It deprived her of the intellectual and literary service of the Spanish people; yet in the face of the most obvious and conspicuous fact of modern history, writers are still found who deny that the Inquisition was injurious to literature. Because there were many great writers after its establishment, it is argued that it cannot have been hostile to the progress of intellect. Hefele has written upon this point a sentence marvellously foolish: "Llorente, it is true, enumerates 118 learned men who were prosecuted by the Inquisition, but omits adding that they escaped without personal injury" (p. 365). By this we are to understand that a scholar is not interrupted in his studies until he is burnt at an *auto da fé*. The *post hoc ergo propter hoc* argument which is used to defend the literary merits of the Inquisition may be applied just as well to the political career of the Habsburgs in Spain. They no sooner ascended the throne, in the person of the Emperor Charles V., than the monarchy became the most powerful in the world, and retained its su-

premacy for near 100 years. It is therefore idle to say that the Habsburg dynasty can have had any part in the decline of Spain during the last century of its rule.

In the attempt to glorify the Inquisition in departments in which it was an unmitigated evil, its really great merit has been generally overlooked. It was a true and effective guardian of the morality of the people. Acting as a sort of religious police, it succeeded in eradicating certain vices and certain crimes. The mediæval wars had developed among the Spaniards of the fifteenth century a barbarous ferocity, and all the evil effects of continued warfare. The Inquisition was the instrument by which greater humanity, morality, and subordination were restored. It was the only disguise in which the Spaniards would submit to the interference of a state police.

This, again, leads us to the second great mischief of the Inquisition, next to the repression of religious thought. It was the religious mask, by means of which absolutism was imperceptibly introduced; for crimes against the State were subject to its jurisdiction as much as crimes against religion. Those, for instance, who exported horses to France in time of war came before its tribunals. It defended the authority of the crown against the nobility and against the Church with as much energy as the purity of faith and morals. But it is due to the Inquisition to admit, that if it was instrumental in establishing despotism in Spain, it likewise saved the people from being degraded by it, and greatly mitigated its oppressiveness. The severity of its procedure, the 20,000 criminals who suffered death during the 300 years of its activity, are the picturesque details which strike the imaginations of men, excite their passions, and conceal from them the serious features of its character, and the real part it has performed in history. It did more than any other thing for the ruin of Church and State in Spain, by promoting political despotism and intellectual stagnation.

---

#### THE NEGRO RACE AND ITS DESTINY.\*

THE scholars of Germany continue to handle the most extensive and intricate investigations with a fullness of erudition

\* *Anthropologie der Naturvölker.* Von Dr. Theodor Waitz. Leipzig, 1860.

which leaves the learned of other nations far behind. Philosophy, history, literature, philology,—over all these fields they have swept, and gathered in abundant harvests; and now, being almost in the predicament of Alexander, and lacking new worlds to conquer, they enter the boundless and trackless plains of *Anthropology*. To us sciolists of Britain the very name has as yet hardly a familiar sound; and as for the thing signified, although our countrymen are unsurpassed in the energy with which they contribute to the stock of raw material, the process of scientific working up has scarcely been seriously attempted amongst us. This latter enterprise is being taken in hand by the Germans, and, if we may judge by the work before us, in the very best manner. Unlike their celebrated countryman, who, when requested to write an essay on “the Camel,” is said to have retired within himself, and evolved the ground-idea of that animal “out of the depths of his moral consciousness,” the present race of philosophers, when describing any people, ransack all literatures for fact-evidence, indicate to the reader with the utmost exactness the sources from which their statements are derived, or on which their theories are founded, and sift the evidence which they have collected, or seem to do so, with a grand judicial impartiality.

To this school of writers belongs the author whose latest production we are to examine to-day. Dr. Theodor Waitz, professor of philosophy at Marburg, is bringing out a series of works on the “*Anthropology of the uncivilised peoples*,” of which the first was devoted to a general survey of the subject, while the second treats of “the Negro peoples and their kindred.” The first work we have not seen; of the second we can speak warmly in praise. Though rugged and unattractive in point of style, it possesses the far higher merits of philosophical method, thoroughness of investigation, and clearness of statement. A catalogue of more than two hundred and fifty separate works, with dates and editions carefully specified, is given at the outset, as forming the “literature” of the subject. The history and actual condition of the Negro race, both as it exists in its native seats, and as it appears after transplantation to European colonies and long residence there under new conditions, are then carefully described. Nowhere is there any hasty theorising; nowhere is a bias perceptible towards any one system or group of opinions rather than another. The only occasions on which there is any sign of our author’s feelings being at all enlisted (and the emotion does him honour) are when he has to notice the statements and reasonings of that class of writers, principally

American, who dishonour God and disgrace their own manhood by asserting that the Negroes are morally and intellectually nearer on a level with the ape than with the white man. Dr. Waitz does not understand that "those who have put out the people's eyes" should now "reproach them with their blindness;"\* that those who have kept the Negro for many generations not in slavery merely, but in a hopeless, abject, stationary slavery, tending to destroy all the higher qualities of manhood,—who, instead of training them up through servitude to freedom, have gone on deliberately breeding them like cattle for the market,—should point to the miserable result of their own crimes as a justification of their unfavourable estimate of the Negro character.

Taking Dr. Waitz for our chief guide, but using, as occasion serves, other collateral evidence, a portion of which has escaped his observation, we proceed to give a summary account of this ill-used race under the following heads:

1. Ethnographical distribution and history.
2. Physical geography of its abode.
3. Conditions of life.
4. Physiological characteristics.
5. Character and intelligence.
6. Family life.
7. Political institutions.
8. Religion.

So far the inquiry will be confined to the Negro in Africa. Crossing the ocean, the observer must then follow him to his new domiciles among the colonial communities, and notice the amount and kind of divergence from the original type which the differing circumstances of those communities have produced. By this means the reader will, it is hoped, be in a position to answer for himself with tolerable confidence certain questions which every lover of his species, and particularly every friend of the African, must have often anxiously put to himself. Such questions are: Whence comes it,—from Divine decree, or great constitutional inferiority, or from some other cause or causes,—that this race is, and always has been, so easily reduced to slavery? How stand the prospects of its future elevation in the scale of humanity, or is it inaccessible to culture, and incapable of progress? Lastly, what is the ideal social state to which the friends of the race should aim at raising it?

*Ethnographical and historical.*—The Negroes must be carefully distinguished from the aboriginal Berbers and Copts,

\* Milton's *Apology for Smectymnus*.



from the intrusive Arabs, and from the tribes of Abyssinia (Bischarya, Gallas, and Nubians). They are also essentially a different race from the Malagasy of Madagascar. Still more marked is the distinction between them and the Fulahs, though the latter are geographically so much intermingled with them. We approach a step nearer to the Negro type when we come to the Congo tribes and the Caffers, who occupy the whole of Africa south of the Line, with the exception of the Hottentot territory. The Hottentots, again, present a type which is a peculiar exaggeration of that of the Negro, and blends with it other features; their language also is wholly different. The true seat of the Negro race at present is a strip of country of from ten to twelve degrees wide, bounded to the north by a line carried from the Senegal to Timbaktu, and from thence north of Lake Tsad to Sennaar on the Blue Nile. As, however, the population of the eastern portion of this region (Darfur, Kordofan, Wadai) is largely composed of other than Negro elements, it may be said that Negroland proper consists of Senegambia, the basin of the Niger, and the basin of Lake Tsad.

The race was probably much more widely spread in former times. Though never the aboriginal population in Egypt (where Negro slaves are unmistakably depicted on some of the oldest monuments), there is reason to believe that they were so in Abyssinia, and that they inhabited the whole breadth of the continent far to the south of their present seats. On the north, it is probable that they once occupied great part of the habitable country between the Desert and the Mediterranean, from which they were dispossessed and driven southwards by the Berbers; for there are several isolated black, or partly black, communities—Negro islands, so to speak (*e.g.* Tuggurt, Tauat, Ghat, and in Fezzan)—scattered over the Great Desert and the countries north of it, like ruined fragments surviving a general denudation.

From the earliest times Negroes appear to have been led away as slaves into other lands: they are so represented, as was said before, on the Egyptian monuments; and, as far back as historical records extend, we find them carried into slavery in Arabia, Persia, and even the Malayan peninsula. At this day, the Mohammedan kingdoms bordering upon Negroland are incessantly sending out Negro-hunting expeditions, in order to provide themselves with slaves. Lastly, it is unnecessary to say that a large portion of the population of America consists of Negro slaves.

The two most noticeable facts in the history of the Negro race are, the Arabic invasion and the European slave-trade.

By the first the Negroes have come within the circle of Mohammedan, by the second within that of Christian influences. It is probable that, even before the rise of Islam, Arabs penetrated into Soudan; but however this may be, it is certain that, from the eleventh century onwards, Arab races have made extensive and permanent settlements in inner Africa, and that it was first about that time\* that Islam penetrated like a wedge the great Negro kingdoms (Songhay, Bourby-Jolof, Bornu, &c.), and shattered them to pieces. It is singular, but most certain, that the Arabs did not press upon Negroland from the east, as might have been expected, but from the north and west. After having overwhelmed the whole northern coast of Africa, and established a flourishing empire in Morocco, they turned from thence southwards, and penetrated into Senegambia. Hence the western Negro tribes, the Mandingos, Jolofs, &c. were the first to embrace the Koran; and from them the religion was propagated eastward and southward. At the present day, the Mandingos have cooled down from their first fervours, and their Mohammedanism is said to be of a merely conventional nature. Other peoples, however, evince no lack of zeal. The Fulahs are at this day (Barth, *passim*) most fanatical and active propagators of the religion of the false prophet, and Islam is still constantly receiving considerable accessions by the conversion of heathen tribes.

The intercourse between the Negroes and Europeans commenced with ill-doing on the part of the latter. About the year 1442, we read of slaves having been brought by Portuguese ships from the western coast to Portugal. Early in the sixteenth century, even before the humane but ill-judged proposal of Las Casas, in 1517, Negroes had been taken to the Spanish West Indies. Upon the establishment of the great trading companies in England, France, and Holland, in the seventeenth century, the slave-trade received an immense expansion. The first Negroes were landed in Virginia in 1620, in New England in 1639. The continuance of the trade was, as all the world knows, forced upon the colonies by the mother country up to the period of the War of Independence. The slave-trade was abolished by England in 1807, by France in 1819, by Spain (nominally) in 1820, by the

\* It was in 1009 (p. 18) that the first ruler of the Songhay empire was converted to Islam. Sixty years later we hear of Mohammedanism and Paganism as subsisting side by side in Gana. In 1350, according to Ibn Batuta, in the Mandingo kingdom of Melle, Islam was incontestably in the ascendant. The kingdoms of Wadai, Darfur, and Kordofan became Mohammedan only in the seventeenth century. Into Loggum Islam penetrated only sixty years ago.

United States in 1807, and by Brazil in 1850. Since the abolition of the slave-trade, the legitimate commerce of Great Britain with Western Africa has enormously increased.

*Physical Geography.*—Under this one head no information will be found in Dr. Waitz's volume, which seems singular, when we consider the undoubted influence which climate and soil exercise on human development. Scattered over the five thick volumes of Dr. Barth (to mention no other source), the curious reader may find ample notices on this subject. The following sketch may here suffice. Negroland, or Soudan, is, speaking generally, a vast tract of flat or undulating country, having but a slight elevation above the sea. It is watered by countless streams, which in the hot season are mostly dry, but in and after the rainy season (from June to September) form fertilising inundations, which cover miles of country. In these low, steaming flats vegetation is wonderfully rapid and exuberant; but the air is deadly in its effect upon European constitutions. There are at different points in this wide region lofty single mountains,—as the Cameroons (13,000 feet) opposite Fernando Po, Mount Alantika (9000 feet) in Adamawa, and Mendif (6000 feet) in Musgu,—but there is no continuous mountain chain of great elevation, unless the little-known chain of the Kong Mountains should prove an exception. The Niger, with its stream of 2200 miles, is the grand physical feature of the region. This is the river, “flowing towards the rising sun,” which the Nasamonian youths, adventuring in search of new discoveries from the Libyan coast across the burning Sahara, fell in with more than 2300 years ago, and found a diminutive race of blacks dwelling in cities on its banks. Herodotus (ii. 32) and his informants supposed this river to be the upper Nile; and, strange to say, it is only since the researches of the last thirty years that this error has been entirely exploded, and the non-communication of the two rivers conclusively proved. Lake Tsad, with its broad margin of low alluvial land, in some places twenty miles wide, yearly overflowed during the rainy season, exactly corresponds to the ἑλη μέγιστα—the immense marshes or fens—through which the Nasamonians are said to have been led on their way to the Niger.

*Conditions of Life.*—These are of two kinds, physical and artificial. As the most influential among those of the first kind, may be named the intense relaxing heat of the climate, and the abundance of cultivable land relatively to population. The first condition, predisposing men to laziness and sensual enjoyment, tempts the powerful to use great exertions to

procure slaves to do their work for them. They could not get it done for hire, any more than the Jamaica planters could after emancipation, because the second condition is continually operative : nature is so bountiful, land so abundant relatively to population, and man in such a climate so disposed to enjoy the present and slight the prospective good, that no one, unless *forced*, would bestow upon the soil any more than the small amount of toil required to raise food enough for his own and his family's subsistence. How should the prospect of hire tempt the free Negro to labour for ten or twelve hours under that burning sun, when he has nothing to do but squat upon a patch of land, on which two or three hours daily toil will amply supply him with food, leaving him the rest of his time for dancing, singing, shouting, gossiping, strutting, and sleeping ?

Among the artificial conditions of life may be named the subdivision of Negroland into so many small states, always at war with one another, always trying to catch slaves on each other's borders ; so that, the tenure of property and life being insecure, no accumulations can be made, and no regular progress in those arts and that culture which attest the civilised man is practicable.

*Physiological Type.*—There are great variations in stature among the Negro tribes, from the Mangas of Bornu, who are over six feet, to the Betsang of inner Africa, who range from three to five feet high. “The brain is, as well taken absolutely as relatively, that is, in proportion to the nerves proceeding from it, smaller than in the European ; the form of its convolutions less favourable ; they are neither equally numerous nor so advantageously developed.” The middle lobe of the brain is prominently developed, while the anterior lobe is receding. The hind head often projects considerably. “The head appears as if compressed on both sides ; the face as long and small ; its lower part juts out, ‘snout-fashion,’ more than in the European ; and the facial angle often amounts to little more than  $70^{\circ}$ .” The forehead is small and round ; the eyes long, narrow, and black ; the cheek-bones stand out, and make the face, from which the broad, thick, flat nose, with wide nostrils, rises but little, appear on a full view as if pressed flat. The mouth is wide, and the lips flabby. The ear is rudely shaped. The foot is marked by the length and breadth of the heel, and is flat. The skin is thicker than that of the European ; is cool to the feel ; and its transpiration has a peculiar, unpleasant odour.

This type, however, is, Dr. Waitz admits, “an extreme form.” It must not be supposed that such is generally the

external aspect of man in Negroland. It would be regarded by most Negroes as a caricature. Still this, according to our author, is nearer to the type of the pure, unadulterated Negro breed than any other which can be defined. This, to our notions, unsightly type it is, which, after all Caucasian admixture is abstracted, remains as the distinctive form to which the race tends to approximate.

*Character and Intelligence.*—The mental calibre of the Negro shows a general conformity, as might be expected, with his inferior physiological type. He is distinguished by a predominance of sensuous perceptivity, and an activity of sensuous fancy, joined to the comparative absence or torpor of the higher intellectual faculties. Such a character causes him to delight in noise and revelry,—to be attracted by the outward shows of things, and little apt to inquire into their hidden relations,—to be fond of gay colours, finery, spectacles of all kinds, loud noises, luscious odours, spicy viands, and sensual indulgence generally. Hence comes his deep reverence for power, if it comes recommended to him by outward pomp. His unbridled fancy leads him to whatever is extravagant and inordinate. His devouring desires easily hurry him into every kind of sensual excess, as well as into enormous crimes. But there are also other traits by which the Negro character is more favourably, and quite as specifically, distinguished. Such are his loyalty to his superiors, the strength of his affections both as parent and as child, his general kind-heartedness, and the enthusiastic warmth of his religious feelings.

The Negro\* is commonly charged with three principal vices,—coarse sensuality, laziness, and unfeeling cruelty. The first is ascribed to him with the most justice, although there are particular tribes to which it is little attributable. As to laziness, Dr. Waitz truly remarks, that it is no peculiarity of the race, but a vice common to all slave populations. We shall presently see in how extended a sense this designation is applicable to the natives of Negroland. Mungo Park† was of opinion that the free Negroes generally were by no means remarkable for laziness. And in Brazil, where just laws enable the slaves to secure their freedom by industry, and afterwards to enjoy all the privileges of freedom and of citizenship, in spite of their colour, travellers‡ testify to innumerable cases of energetic and successful industry on the part of Negroes. At the same time, it must be admitted that, when left to himself, although susceptible of passionate excitement, the Negro does appear incapable of

\* p. 206.

† Travels, i. 280.

‡ See Kidder and Fletcher, *passim*.

sustained, forecasted, regular exertion. This may arise partly from the effects of climate, partly from natural disposition. As for the third vice laid to his charge, that of cruelty, the Negro certainly has small regard for a human life. Father Peureux, in a letter respecting the superstitions of the Gaboon Negroes,\* who inhabit the coast south of Fernando Po, gives some horrible details touching the frequent murders of persons by their own blood-relations, who are impelled by the belief that the relics of such persons, if worn about them, will prove a sovereign preservative against the attacks of their enemies, and ill-fortune of every kind. Nor can the long list of European travellers be forgotten whose valuable lives have been sacrificed to the African's cupidity or caprice. Still he must rather be described as bloodthirsty than as cruel; he kills, but he does not, like the North-American Indian, reserve his victims for future tortures.

But there is a farther assertion, grounded on this charge of cruelty, which is one of those that move our author's bile. It is "that the lot of the African slave in America is, on account of this prevailing feature of cruelty in the Negro character, more desirable than that of the slave in Africa." It is easy to see that this bolt comes from an American quiver; nor is the falsehood of the assertion more transparent than the sinister purpose in making it. Dr. Waitz immediately brings to bear a whole volley of testimony proving the exact contrary. In doing this, he takes occasion to show the enormous extension of slavery in the Negro countries. Park states† that in the Mandingo country (Senegambia) the proportion of slaves to free was as three to one; in the Yoruba country it has been discovered to rise to four to one; but three to one may be taken as the average proportion throughout Negroland, even at the present day. This one fact disposes at once of many philanthropic aspirations. It shows that *the European or American demand for slaves is not responsible for African slavery*, and that, were it totally withdrawn, the state of things would remain the same. Next, Dr. Waitz establishes, by copious citation of authors, the general statement, that "the relations of slaves in Negroland are without doubt far more favourable than in America, and that it is even impossible to treat them so ill in the former as in the latter country." He shows, for instance, that in parts of Western Africa the slaves have two days in the week to themselves, while the house-slaves in Nuffi have half their time at their own disposal; that among the Jolofs, they seldom beat their slaves, eat out of the same dish with

\* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, Jan. 1860. † Vol. i. 287.

them, and care for their children as if they were their own ; that in Bonny the slave sometimes marries his master's daughter ; that in Nuffi (hear it, border-ruffians of Missouri !) the murder of a slave is punished with death, just like any other murder. In short, the general position of slaves in Negroland is not oppressive : it corresponds to the patriarchal organisation of society which prevails there ; and it abundantly proves the possession by the Negroes of that natural kind-heartedness which we before stated to be a national characteristic. In connection with this subject, some touching stories in Park's Travels will be remembered, as well as his general statement that he had never met with a single Negro woman from whom he had not experienced the kindest and tenderest treatment.

With regard to honesty, the general rule is, that it varies in the inverse ratio of the Negro's intercourse with Europeans. Theft is always a common vice with slaves ; yet an Englishman who was overseer on a plantation in Cuba\* thinks, that " almost the worst thief among them, if appointed to a responsible situation, where he should see confidence reposed in him by his master, would not lightly break it."

With regard to the natural intellectual endowments of the Negro, Dr. Waitz takes on the whole a favourable view. While admitting that in his own country, and apart from all foreign influence, his intellectual achievements have been and are extremely small, and that his capacity for sustained reflection and abstract thought seems to be deficient, he points to a variety of facts which prove that, at least in all the lower intellectual powers, the Negro is as well, perhaps better, furnished than the European. For instance, he has a remarkably retentive memory ; so much so, that in the schools of Protestant missions Negro children " often outstrip their white school-fellows in development, and only fall behind them about the twelfth year, when the faculty of reflection begins to take the upper hand." Even this deficiency of reflection, Waitz thinks, may be an effect of climate and social relations, and therefore remediable. Again, he exhibits extreme acuteness and expertness in his business dealings with Europeans ; and shows in this relation great power of estimating character, and of modifying his behaviour accordingly. The race also produces great men, *e.g.* the king of Sulimana, mentioned by Laing, and the chief of Timneh, by Clarke ; a proof in itself that it is capable of that progressive elevation by culture which is ordinarily worked out by the action of extraordinary minds. On the whole,

\* Taylor's United States and Cuba, 1851.

while allowing that philanthropists have exaggerated the capacity of the Negro, Dr. Waitz energetically condemns the interested judgment passed by some Americans, which would place him hardly on a higher level than the ape, allowing him the imitative faculties, but denying to him the capability of true culture.

*Family Life.*—It is when we unfold this chapter of the natural history of the Negro, that we begin to comprehend the deep moral debasement into which paganism plunges the fallen nature of man. The reader of Dr. Waitz will stand aghast at the disclosure, guaranteed by numerous unimpeachable witnesses, of the frightful impurity which surrounds the intercourse between the sexes in Negroland, and of the consequent degradation of women. Writing for general readers, we can give but faint and far-off touches of a state of things which is enough to move a true Christian heart to tears of blood.

The patriarchal organisation of society, while, as we said, it implies mild treatment of the slave, implies also that all the subordinate members of the family are more or less in a servile condition with reference to its head. This state of things, which Sir Robert Filmer thought so delightful as to declare it to be the natural and only desirable relation between ruler and subject, involves in Negroland consequences which would perhaps have staggered even the author of the "Patriarcha." A man's wife, or wives, being his *quasi* slaves, are regarded by him as articles of property, and as subject to the incidents of ownership. Hence, not only is the wife purchased to begin with (a custom not altogether confined to Negroland), but she is exchanged, lent, prostituted, and transferred by her husband just like any other chattel. Sometimes even a wife is taken on trial, or for a limited time. Conjugal infidelity is not regarded by the husband as an attack on his honour, but as an infringement of his rights of property, and can therefore generally be compounded for by fine.\* Similarly, it is not uncommon for the head of the family to sell his own blood-relations, who being born in his house are his slaves, into slavery abroad. It seems, however,† that this is seldom done except under the severest pressure, and that intercourse with Europeans and dram-drinking are the usual incentives.

Polygamy is an obvious and almost universal feature of Negro family life. Poverty of course compels great numbers of free negroes to be content with one wife,—a piece of mortification which for the same reason is practised by

\* p. 114.

† p. 124.



many Turks; but the only people, according to Dr. Waitz,\* who are monogamists on principle are the Banjuns, who were converted to Catholicity long ago by the Portuguese. The inherent evils of polygamý seem to be somewhat lessened by the circumstance,—general throughout Negroland,—that there is one head wife, the *δέσποινις* of the household, to whom all the others are subordinate. Chastity before marriage is held in little or no account. As of old among the Hebrews, it is the deepest reproach to Negro wives to be childless, and, like Rachel and Leah, they often treat the children by their husbands of their female slaves as their own. Deformed children and twins are frequently made away with as soon as born. Divorce is easily obtainable, even by the wife; neglect or ill-usage is sufficient to justify it. Of the worse than phallic rites and abominable practices which take place among the young of both sexes, it is impossible here to speak.

Yet as some relief to this dark picture, it is a satisfaction to record that instances† are not absolutely wanting of even romantic conjugal love; that respect and solicitude are almost universally shown by youth to age; and that nothing can exceed the deep *pietas* with which the Negro regards his mother. Park noticed this long ago, and all subsequent travellers corroborate his statement.

*Religion.*—Before speaking of the different degrees in which religions introduced from abroad have extended themselves among the Negro race, it will be proper to give a short account of the *religio loci*. At the very outset one startling fact meets us. It has been assumed by philosophers that the original religion of the Negro is Fetishism, and Comte in his Positive Philosophy‡ uses the supposed fact to ground upon it his theory of the development of religious doctrine, by the operation of natural law, from Fetishism through the successive stages of Polytheism and Monotheism into Positivism, i. e. Atheism. But the truth is, not only that at the present day Monotheism coexists with Fetishism throughout the pagan Negro tribes from the Gambia to Loango, where not the slightest suspicion of the influence of Mohammedanism can be entertained, but also that traces are not wanting§ of the prevalence of a purer Theism in ancient times than can now be met with. Over the whole tract of country above referred to, the natives believe in a Supreme Good Being as the creator and sovereign ruler of the world. Rupi, Olorun, Mawu, Tschuku,—are among the various names by which

\* p. 108.

† p. 116.

‡ Martineau's Abridgment, ii. 186.

§ p. 171.

this Supreme Being is designated. It is true, that just as in China the ordinary name for God signifies also the firmament of heaven,\* so in Negroland all these names for the Deity signify also some part or power of the material creation, as the sun, the rain, the sky, or the lightning. But the Yebust are said to possess a still purer worship. They address to the unseen Creator, whom they call "the King of Heaven," such petitions as these,—“God in heaven, protect me from sickness and death;” “God, give me good fortune and wisdom.” Nor does this belief in a Supreme God invariably remain a mere barren opinion. The Negro is said† often to console himself in misfortune with such ejaculations as, “God looks on me;” “I am in God’s hand,” &c.

Yet, on the other hand, it is too true that a barbarous, systemless, idolatrous superstition far overbalances in the Negro’s consciousness these purer conceptions. Though believing in a Creator, he seldom thinks it worth while to invoke Him, partly because, like the Epicurean, he imagines him “*securum agere ævum*,” and to be unconcerned by the petty affairs of mortals, partly because he conceives the whole of nature to be instinct with supernatural life and power, to be peopled with spirits active for good or evil; and hence, that whatever time or thought he can spare for religion should in reason be devoted to gaining their patronage, or disarming their hostility. Hence arises Fetish-worship. “According to the view of the Negro, a spirit resides, or may reside, in every sensuous object, and often a very great and powerful one occupies an object that is quite unsightly. He conceives of this spirit, not as firmly and unalterably joined to the corporeal thing in which it dwells, but only as having its ordinary or principal abode therein.” Sometimes he distinguishes the spirit from the tenement which it informs; “but the more common case is, that he mentally groups together the two, as forming one whole, and this whole is (as Europeans name it) ‘the Fetish,’ the object of his religious worship.” Like most idolatrous peoples, he does not unravel his religious ideas, or reduce them to a logical order. “His Fetish is to him a god, and at the same time a mere idol, a block of wood; he is the god himself and that which is consecrated to the god or possessed by him,—a tree, an animal, a vessel, a sacrifice, an altar, an inspired priest or seer, a temple;—he is the god himself, and that which is endowed by him with miraculous power,—a medicine, an amulet, a lucky or unlucky day, a forbidden food, a poison.”

It need scarcely be added to this description, that there

\* Tien.

† p. 169.

‡ p. 173.

is hardly any connection between the practical religion of the Negro and the principles of morality. He believes that what the gods punish in the next world is not murder, theft, or adultery, but the non-observance of festivals, the neglect of prescribed abstinences, and similar ceremonial shortcomings. But to describe the various monstrous, absurd, or revolting developments of this Fetish superstition would require a volume. The letter of Father Peureux above quoted particularises a few of the most cruel and unnatural. St. Paul's account\* of the moral condition of the Gentile world in his day may be literally applied in almost every particular to the state of Negroland now; of which many dark and atrocious inventions of the devil stand recorded that are not noticed in the fearful catalogue of the Apostle.

But a large proportion—the means of ascertaining it with even an approach to exactness do not exist—of the inhabitants of Negroland are now the adherents of religions of foreign introduction. Of these the vast majority profess Islam, to which, as before noticed, the western and northern Negro countries—Senegambia, Borgu, Haussa, Kanem, Bornu, Baghirmi—have all been converted, and which is still making constant advances among the tribes to the south and east. That the pagan Negro is on the whole a gainer by conversion to Islam seems undeniable. Dr. Waitz thinks that the gain is absolutely unqualified; but to this the attentive readers of Barth, a thoroughly impartial witness, are likely to demur. If many devils are cast out, there are some that retain their hold, and some evil germs are introduced which were unknown before. The Mohammedan Negro no longer offers human sacrifices; he is no longer under the thralldom of the brutalising superstitions, which plunged him in his pagan days into unnumbered follies and cruelties; he rises to the notion of self-respect, and has more of the dignity of man;—he worships one only God, the creator and ruler of the universe; he learns to have a regard for truth; he comes under the influence of a literature, and rejoices in the participation of a great tradition. On the other hand, his conversion to Islam generally inspires him with an inordinate pride, to which he was before a stranger;—it very frequently leads to his assuming the odious character of a Tartuffe, or religious hypocrite; it seems to increase his cupidity, and from being a simple slave-holder, too often transforms him into an inveterate slave hunter and trader; it imposes little restraint on his cruelty, and none at all on his sensuality. Polygamy, that bane of social life, the existence of which

\* Rom. i.

precludes the advance of a people in true culture, is sanctioned both by the precept and the example of the Prophet.

We have now to speak of the degree in which the Negro race has been influenced by Christianity. Dr. Waitz seems to think that conversion to Islam is calculated to benefit the race in a higher degree than conversion to Christianity, and that the religion of Europeans, as such, must be less suitable for the Negro than that of the Arabs, from whom he differs so far less widely. But he forgets that the religion of Christ is of Asiatic, not of European, origin; that it arose in that border-land which is the point of junction of the three continents—Europe, Asia, and Africa,—as if to show its equal suitability to all three; and that the Ethiopian minister of Queen Candace was among the earliest converts of the apostolic age. It is, indeed, unhappily true; that the enormities practised by European slave-dealers cannot but have alienated the Negro from the religion which such men professed, and of which he saw no other representatives. But that, when Christianity is presented to him under more favourable circumstances, the Negro readily and heartily embraces it, the evidence which we shall bring will clearly establish.

In Africa, indeed, Christianity has as yet made little way with him. We will speak first of the Protestant missions. The chief centres of these are Sierra Leone, Yoruba, and the Niger. Sierra Leone, having been for years the port at which the slave cargoes rescued by the British cruisers are set at liberty, has a large free black population, the capital, Freetown, containing 40,000 souls. Of these certainly a large proportion adhere to one or other of the Protestant sects. The Wesleyans in 1859 had thirty chapels in Freetown, and numbered their congregations at more than 13,000. The Church Missionary Society claims 3693 “communicants,” which implies perhaps 7000 or 8000 as the total number of their congregations. But a more promising field appears to be Yoruba, in which the principal station, Abeokuta, is the head-quarters of an energetic and excellent man, Mr. S. Crowther, a Negro clergyman. Mainly by Mr. Crowther’s exertions missions have been lately established at three different points on the Niger, Rabba, Onitsha, and Ghebe, at the confluence of the Niger, and Tsadda. At present, however, the impression made on heathenism is not great in itself, and the obstacles are many. Mr. Hinderer,\* cautioning the Society against being too sanguine, writes, that “the converts are but as yet as two or three in a hundred, and much domestic persecution still exists, and the

\* Abstract of Report of Church Missionary Society, May 1860.

idolatrous priesthood are intriguing, and the Mohammedan tribes are alarmed," &c. The Niger missions are as yet quite in their infancy.

We have not the materials at hand for presenting a complete picture of the state of the Catholic missions. The chief centres are, the Senegal, Sierra Leone, the Gaboon River, and Fernando Po. From the Senegal, where there is a Bishop, Christianity must have made its influence strongly felt, since we learn\* that the temporary marriages which had been common among the neighbouring tribes have in consequence of that influence been discontinued. But of the number of converts we possess no information. In 1858, a society for preaching the Gospel in Western Africa was formed at Lyons, through the exertions of Mgr. de Marion Bressillac, to whom the Holy See confided, as Vicar Apostolic, the districts of Sierra Leone and Liberia. Unhappily, this zealous prelate, with several of his clergy, fell a victim to a pestilence which broke out at Sierra Leone some months after his landing there, and we are not aware of a successor having been as yet appointed. It is announced, however,† that the mission of Sierra Leone has been recently committed by the Holy See to the English province of the Society of Jesus. A flourishing mission has been in existence for some years at the Gaboon River; but the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, which tell us so much, are sparing of statistics. Of what has been effected at Fernando Po since the revival of Spanish rule there, we have no precise information.

In America the Negro, as might be expected, generally follows the religion of his master, and professes Christianity. Only the Mina Negroes in Brazil‡ are spoken of as still remaining Mohammedans. That this external assumption of Christianity is very generally found to coexist with an almost total disregard of morality, is very true, and, if the circumstances are minutely weighed, not very astonishing. But if it can be shown that the exhibition of apostolic charity, zeal, and patience on the part of his evangelizers has been often rewarded by a flourishing growth of all Christian virtues on the part of the Negro, then Dr. Waitz's opinion of the superior suitability of the Mussulman creed to the Negro character must fall to the ground. Then the only prayer of the Christian must be, that God would once again send forth worthy labourers into this ample harvest. Then the chief aim of all his active efforts to benefit the Negro race must be, to pave the way for the ambassadors of Christ; to do what in him lies to

\* Waitz, p. 261.

† Catholic Directory, 1860.

‡ Kidder and Fletcher, p. 136.

hasten the advent, and to forward the work, of such men as St. Peter Claver, whose wonderful apostleship among the Negroes bore, as we shall presently see, such prodigious fruit to heaven.

According to Olmsted,\* an intelligent and impartial authority, but a small proportion of the slaves in Virginia profess Christianity at all. Those who do, attach themselves to one or other of the various Protestant sects. The system of the Baptists has an especial attraction for them; there is a thoroughness in the practice of "immersion" which strikes their fancy. But the general testimony in Virginia is to the effect that the "profession" of religion by the Negro is seldom attended by moral improvement. Some go so far as to assert† that the majority of the "professors" are great scoundrels. Olmsted was informed‡ that, dancing having been "preached against," the slaves had lately taken to gambling and worse practices. In South Carolina and Georgia§ the Negroes, whose love of religious excitement is a part of their character, are always having "revivals," which they conduct with all the noise and racket imaginable. The free blacks, taken as a class,|| are said to be not less, if not even more, morally degraded than the slaves. Indeed it would seem that, among the whole labouring population of the Southern States, white as well as black (leaving out of consideration the Irish and Germans), the profession of Protestantism has come to be quite disconnected from the practice of morality. According to Olmsted,¶ the lowest, most ignorant Mexican peon does not stand so low in the scale of man as the degraded "poor white" of South Carolina. Such are among the fruits of the iniquitous slave system of the United States.

From the English West-Indian Islands the accounts which reach us of the religious state of the Negroes are far more cheerful. We hear of their subscribing large sums to missionary societies at home, and of their supporting their ministers (the Wesleyans, we believe, are the favourite sect) with enthusiastic liberality.

Of the religious state of the Negroes whose lot has fallen among Catholic races, we shall have to speak incidentally, when we come to the consideration of the position of the Negro in the various colonial communities. At present our purpose is to show how the greatest preacher and teacher who ever laboured amongst them dealt with the peculiar

\* Southern Slave States, 1850, p. 113.

† Ibid.

‡ p. 128.

§ p. 450.

|| pp. 99, 129, 132.

¶ p. 509.

conditions of the problem, and in what degree he was successful.

Peter Claver, a lay brother of the Society of Jesus, arrived in Carthagena, then the principal emporium of Spanish trade in South America, in the year 1610.\* His sympathies were immediately aroused for the poor Negroes, cargoes of whom were continually arriving in the port; and after his ordination in 1615, he "devoted himself entirely and for ever to their service." For forty years, until his death in 1655, he never for one day flagged in his devotion to the cause, and during all that time made himself literally "the slave of the slaves."

His practice was this: as soon as a slave-ship arrived at Carthagena, he went on board attended by his interpreters, and carrying on his back a bag containing biscuits, flasks of brandy, and other little delicacies fit for the solace of sick persons. On arriving on board, his first care was for the sick. For these he immediately procured all the alleviation of their sufferings which the cases admitted of; distributing among them the creature comforts which he had brought, and administering such sacraments as they were in a condition to receive. Then collecting together those who were in health, he "erected an altar, on which he placed pictures suited to give those uncultivated minds some idea of the mysteries of religion." The most conspicuous of these was a very striking picture representing Christ upon the cross. He next ascertained by careful inquiry which of the Negroes, if any, had been already baptised. He then expounded to them one by one, in few but distinct words, which were translated by the interpreters, the principal mysteries of religion; and the burning charity which glowed in his face and trembled in his voice, was yet more persuasive than the words themselves. After the explanation of each mystery, he instructed his hearers to make an act of faith in it. To make them more fully understand the regenerating efficacy of baptism, he would say, "'My children, we must be like the serpent, which throws off its old skin to receive another more beautiful and brilliant;' and then drew his nails across his hands, as if he would tear off the skin. The poor slaves, watchful of his slightest motions, did the same, to show him that they understood his meaning." When he thought them sufficiently instructed, he appointed a day for their baptism. He had the greatest trouble with the Negroes from Guinea, who, besides being naturally proud and unyielding, were more or less imbued with Mohammedanism. But he never gave up or despaired; and his apostolic fervour and ineffable charity

\* See the *Oratorian Life* (Richardson, 1849).

bent at last the most stubborn will. After the ceremony of baptism, he would make them an address, in which he exhorted them to "observe faithfully the law of Jesus Christ, whose members they had become; and to die rather than violate it by a single sin; adding, that if unfortunately they should commit any, they would find a salutary remedy, a secure and ever-open resource, in contrition and confession; after which he explained to them the way in which Christians should receive the sacrament of penance."

But Father Claveri was not satisfied with making his Negroes Christians; he would have them good and virtuous Christians. How watchful, patient, firm, ingenuous, indefatigable he was, in order to gain his point, our limits do not permit us to portray. He daily went his rounds among their huts and barracks, never forgetting to cater for their bodily enjoyment in all things lawful (for he well knew the Negro character), but sternly repressing any thing like vice. He did not "preach against" but encouraged dancing among them, knowing how great a relief and recreation it was to frames over-burdened by toil; but at the least symptom of indelicacy he interfered and broke up the amusement. He never passed a Negro in the street without some words of admonition suitable to his age or to what he knew of his character. He passed whole days in the confessional, particularly during Lent, regardless of the intense heat and of the overpowering smell of the Negroes who crowded round him; and as long as there were any Negroes waiting, he would hear the confession of no white person. "Credible persons who observed him have declared that during one Lent he confessed more than five thousand Negroes."

How did the Negroes receive and profit by the Christianity so recommended to them? "Wherever they met with him," after their baptism, "they always showed the same demonstrations of love and respect. They ran in crowds to meet him, and prostrating themselves on the ground, called him their master, their protector, their father, never thinking they did enough to express their gratitude." His admonitions, we are told, "were usually effectual: fear of God's chastisements sufficed to maintain in virtue, or withdraw from vice, many of those savages who had been till then insensible to every thing else. Moreover, the authority he had gained over their minds, and their affection for him, made them obey without reply or difficulty; the mere sight of him would check the most unruly, and even the vicious, when they met him, knelt down to ask his blessing." The number of Negroes whom he himself in the course of his ministry



brought into the Christian fold was truly astonishing. "A religious questioned him on this subject shortly before he died, to whom he answered, that he thought he had baptised more than three hundred thousand; but as humility always led him to diminish the number of his good works, it has been asserted by persons likely to be well informed, that he had baptised at least four hundred thousand."

Perhaps we have now said enough to enable our readers to judge of the soundness of Dr. Waitz's opinion as to the "unsuitability" of the Christian religion to the Negro character.

In a sequel to this Article (since we have reached, if not exceeded, our limits), we shall proceed to a survey of the present condition of the Negro in América, and conclude with such observations upon the probable or desirable destiny of the race as the results of the entire investigation may seem to justify.

## Communicated Articles.

### THE ANCIENT SAINTS.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### ST. CHRYSOSTOM.—THE EXILE.

At length our great Confessor has arrived at his appointed place of exile. He reached it faint and exhausted in body and soul; but, as was usual with him, he soon rallied; and began to colour every thing about him with his own sweet, cheerful, thankful temper. In two days he had recovered his equanimity. He was pleased with all that was in any way pleasant; he made the best of what was bad; he blotted out the trials of the past; he fed his imagination with good hopes for the future. He generously and gallantly threw himself upon his lot, and tenderly embraced the cross; and though, as we shall see, the miseries of Cucusus grew on him, in spite of himself, as time went on, still he was determined he would like the place; and he did like it as long as ever he could, and, after the manner of the exiled sovereign in the drama, "found sermons in stones, and good in every thing."

He wrote to Olympias, in letters from which I quoted in the foregoing chapter, that the place promised well; that the climate was like Antioch; that he was too well housed to fear

the winter, and too sure of the winter to fear the Isaurians ; that he had had a hearty welcome on the spot ; that Adelphius, the Bishop, was kind ; that Sopater, the Prefect of Armenia, left nothing undone for his protection ; that friends from Antioch had come over to receive him on his arrival ; and, lastly, that he did not doubt that he should eventually be restored to Constantinople. If the trials of his journey still remained on his memory, it was in order to give a zest to his enjoyment of the repose which had now succeeded to them, and to indispose him to move again. Accordingly, he begged his friends not to attempt to gain from government his transference to any other place, unless, indeed, it was in the immediate neighbourhood of the imperial city. He was happy when he was let alone ; but it was a tremendous penance to travel. Something of all this has already been given in his own words, and more shall now follow :

*To Olympias.*

“ . . . All these evils have vanished. On arriving at Cucusus, I got rid of all remains of my malady, and I am in most perfect health ; and I am released from my fear of the Isaurians, for there is a strong force of soldiers here who are ready and eager for an engagement ; and there is an abundance of all that is necessary, which flows in upon me on every side, all parties welcoming me with the greatest good-will, in spite of the extreme desolateness of the place. My lord Dioscorus happened to be there ; and he had even sent a domestic to me to Cæsarea for the very purpose of inviting, nay begging, me to accept his house and no other ; and many others did the same. I availed myself by preference of his offer, as I felt I ought to do, and took up my abode with him ; and he has been every thing to me, so that I have been continually protesting against the lavish expense which he has been at on my account. He has even left his house to me, and gone to live at some other place, in order to show me every attention possible ; and he got the house into a condition to weather the winter, busying himself with this object in every way. In a word, he has left nothing undone which could be of service to me. Many others too, agents and stewards, have received letters from their masters, ordering them to call upon me, as they have done continually, and in every way to study my comfort.

And now I have told you all about me, the distressing past and the favourable present, lest any friend should be precipitate in getting me removed elsewhere. If these persons, who wish to be kind to me, put into my own hands the choice where to dwell, instead of taking on themselves to assign the place, in that case I accept the favour. But if they remove me hence, in order to send me elsewhere, and there is to be another journey and another exile, this would be far more painful to me than my present condition—

first, because of the chance of my relegation to a more distant or worse country ; next, because travelling is to me worse than ten thousand banishments. For the inconveniences of my late journey brought me to the very gates of death ; and now here I am in Cucusus, recruiting myself by an uninterrupted rest and quiet, and by that quiet nursing my long distress and my shattered bones and wearied flesh.

My lady the Deaconess Sabiniana arrived here the same day that I did, knocked up, indeed, and wearied out, as being of that advanced age when travel is a toil ; but in her earnestness a girl, and making no account of suffering, and ready, as she said, to go as far as Scythia ; for the report went that I was to be deported thither. And now her mind is made up, she says, never to go away again, but to remain wherever I am. The ecclesiastics of the place received her with much attention and kindness. Moreover, my honoured lord, the most religious priest Constantius, would have been here long ago ; for he wrote to me asking my leave to come, because, he said, he would not venture on the step without my judgment, much as he desired it, and certain as it was he could not remain at home ; for he is in hiding, such troubles, he says, are upon him. On this account I beg you not to exert yourself for the change of my abode, for here I am enjoying great relief,—so much so that, in the course of two days, all the troubles of my journey have been wiped out of my mind" (*Ep.* 43).

In a few days he wrote again to the same correspondent, in answer to a letter brought to him by Patricius :

"Why do you bewail me? Why beat your breast, and abandon yourself to the tyranny of despondency? Why are you grieved because you have failed in effecting my removal from Cucusus? Yet, as far as your own part is concerned, you have effected it, since you have left nothing undone in attempting it. Nor have you any reason to grieve for your ill success ; perhaps it has seemed good to God to make my race-course longer that my crown may be brighter. You ought to leap and dance and crown yourself for this, viz. that I should be accounted worthy of so great a matter, which far exceeds my merit. Does my present loneliness distress you? On the contrary, what can be more pleasant than my sojourn here? I have quiet, calm, much leisure, excellent health. To be sure, there is no market in the city, nor any thing on sale ; but this does not affect me ; for all things, as if from some fountains, flow in upon me. Here is my lord, the Bishop of the place, and my lord Dioscorus, making it their sole business to make me comfortable. That excellent person Patricius will tell you in what good spirits and lightness of mind, and amid what kind attentions, I am passing my time" (*Ep.* 14).

The same is his report to his friends at Cæsarea, and the same are his expressions of gratitude and affection towards

them. The following is addressed to the President of Capadocia :

*To Carterius.*

"Cucusus is a place desolate in the extreme ; however, it does not annoy me so much by its desolateness as it relieves me by its quiet and its leisure. Accordingly, I have found a sort of harbour in this desolateness ; and have sat me down to recover breath after the miseries of the journey, and have availed myself of the quiet to dispose of what remained both of my illness and of the other troubles which I have undergone. I say this to your illustriousness, knowing well the joy you feel in this rest of mine. I can never forget what you did for me in Cæsarea, in quelling those furious and senseless tumults, and striving to the utmost, as far as your powers extended, to place me in security. I give this out publicly wherever I go, feeling the liveliest gratitude to you, my most worshipful lord, for so great solicitude towards me" (*Ep.* 236).

To Hymnetius, who attended him in his illness at Cæsarea, he says : "I shall never give over my praises of you, in all companies, as a worthy man and the best of physicians, and a true friend. Whenever I have to speak here of my illness, of course you come into my story ; and I am necessarily full of the benefits which I experienced from your great skill and kindness, which it is the greatest gratification to myself to enlarge upon." He adds, "Well as I am, I would give a good sum to attract you here, were it only to get the sight of you" (*Ep.* 81). To Firminus, another Cæsarean, he says : "Even to have been in your company once has served to make me love you dearly ; and you are yourself the cause of it, for from the first moment you showed an extreme and enthusiastic affection towards me ; and instead of leaving me to time to gain experience of you, you took me captive at sight, and bound me closely to you. This is why I write to you, and tell you what you are eager to hear. What is that ? Why, that I am in health, that I finished my journey without accident, that I am revelling in perfect quiet and leisure, that I have met with great kindness from all parties, that I am enjoying unspeakable consolation" (*Ep.* 80). And in like manner to Leontius : "From your city I was driven, from my love for you I have not been driven ; for it rested with others whether I should remain there or be cast out, but this thing depends upon me. Nor shall any one avail to deprive me of this privilege ; but whithersoever I am carried, every where I carry with me the honey of my love for you, and revel in the recollection of you" (*Ep.* 83). "I have reached Cucusus in health," he says to Faustinus, "and have found a place free from tumult, full of leisure and quiet,

and without a soul to annoy me or to send me off. Nor is it wonderful that I should have these advantages here, when even the route hither from you, which is so desolate, so dangerous, of such ill repute, was traversed by me without alarms, without adventures, with the enjoyment of greater security than is found in the best-regulated cities" (*Ep.* 84).

While he had this keen sensibility towards the kindnesses done him on his journey, he had no remembrance of the injuries. As to his enemies generally, there is hardly a word against them in the multitude of his private letters which have been preserved. He had spoken of his military attendants with cheerful hopefulness at Nicæa; he speaks of them with satisfaction at Cucusus, though they had shown neither spirit nor generosity at Cæsarea. He was too humble to exact much; he was too resigned not to be content with little. But what is stranger, is his bearing towards Evethius, who seems to have been the tool of his Bishop in frightening the Saint away, on a false alarm, from Seleucia's hospitable villa, and in sending him out in the dark at midnight, with a fever upon him, to stumble among the mountains and to get an overturn in his litter. This priest, indeed, is considered by great authorities to have been, not a Cæsarean, but a friend of the Saint's, who accompanied him from Nicæa. There was such a friend with him at Cucusus certainly; but he seems to me to have joined him at a later date; on the other hand it is certain that Chrysostom knew two persons of the name, and that one of them lived at Cæsarea. Evethius, then, I consider, was one of those priests who had been civil to him up to the time that the Bishop forbade such civility, and who then took part with the Bishop. Chrysostom remembered his beginning rather than his end, as the following letter will show. It will be observed, too, that here, as in a letter I just now quoted, he has forgotten his "alarms and risks," as well as the priest's rough behaviour.

*To Evethius.*

"Though I am absent from you in body, yet in charity I am bound to your soul; so large a claim of friendship have you deposited with me, in the great attention and kindness which you showed towards me in your own city. Therefore, wherever I go, I never fail to make my acknowledgments to you. And I beg you to write to me frequently, and to give me good tidings about your health. As regards myself, I finished my whole journey without trouble or danger, and am now living at Cucusus, revelling in the quiet and leisure of the place, and enjoying great attention and kindness at the hands of its inhabitants" (*Ep.* 173).

What is a still stronger evidence of his placable spirit, is the tone in which he speaks of the vile Pharetrius himself, in a letter to a friend, who seems to have held some high post at Constantinople, and who had taken a prominent part in defending the Saint from his enemies. Prudence also, it will be observed, dictated this course.

*To Pæanius.*

"The matter of Pharetrius is certainly most painful ; however, considering his presbyters have had no dealings with my enemies, as you say, nor have any wish to make common cause with them, but, on the contrary, profess still to be on my side, make no movement against them on this account, though what Pharetrius did to me is unpardonable. However, all his clergy felt pain, and gave open expression to their feeling, and were on my side of the question altogether. Lest, then, we cause a reaction among them, and make them violent, I advise you, after you have heard the whole matter from my soldiers, to keep it to yourself, and to deal with them very gently. I know your discreet ways ; and so say for me that I have heard how much the bishop was distressed at what occurred, and how ready he was to undergo any suffering in order to put right all the flagrant acts which had been committed.

I am in good health, and have shaken off the remains of my illness ; and, when I reflect what anxiety you have shown on this point, it is of itself a medicine to me to have gained so affectionate a friend in you. God reward you for the earnestness, love, zeal, and vigilance which you manifest in my cause, both in this world and in the next : may He defend and guard and protect you, and vouchsafe to you those His secret blessings. And may He grant me to see your dear face soon, and to enjoy your sweet spirit, and thus to hold the best of festivals. For you know well that it is a real festival to me, and a high day, to be allowed your most sweet and profitable converse once again" (*Ep.* 204).

Thus the Saint was ever forgetting his enemies in his friends. And, while it was his gift over to be making new ones, he did not lose his old. His former people at Antioch vied in their services to him with his partisans at Constantinople and his newly-made acquaintance at Cæsarea. They came to see him, and returned home full of his praises. The enthusiasm which he inspired spread into Syria and Cilicia. Large sums of money were offered him for his support, both at Antioch, and by rich persons in the neighbourhood of Cucusus. One or two letters of this date will serve as a specimen of many.

*To Diogenes.*

"Cucusus is indeed a desolate spot, and moreover unsafe to dwell in, from the continual danger to which it is exposed of bri-

gands. You, however, though away, have turned it for me into a paradise. For, when I hear of your abundant zeal and charity in my behalf, so genuine and warm (it does not at all escape me, far removed as I am from you), I possess a great treasure and untold wealth in such affection, and feel myself to be dwelling in the safest of cities, by reason of the great gladness which bears me up, and the high consolation which I enjoy" (*Ep.* 144).

Diogenes was one of the friends who sent him supplies : he writes in answer :

"You know very well yourself that I have ever been one of your most warmly attached admirers ; therefore I beg you will not be hurt at my having returned your presents. I have pressed out of them and have quaffed the honour which they did me ; and if I return the things themselves, it has been from no slight or distrust of you, but because I was in no need of them. I have done the same in the case of many others ; for many others too, with a generosity like yours, ardent friends of mine, have made me the same offers ; and the same apology has set me right with them which I now ask you to receive. If I am in want, I will ask these things of you with much freedom, as if they were my own property, nay with more, as the event will show. Receive them back, then, and keep them carefully ; so that, if there is a call for them some time hence, I may reckon on them" (*Ep.* 50).

As a fellow to the above, I add one of his letters

*To Carteria.*

"What are you saying ? that your unintermitting ailments have hindered you from visiting me ? but you *have* come, you *are* present with me. From your very intention I have gained all this, nor have you any need to excuse yourself in this matter. That warm and true charity of yours, so vigorous, so constant, suffices to make me very happy. What I have ever declared in my letters, I now declare again, that, wherever I may be, though I be transported to a still more desolate place than this, you and your matters I never shall forget. Such pledges of your warm and true charity have you stored up for me, which length of time can never quench nor waste ; but, whether I am near you or far away, ever do I cherish that same charity, being assured of the loyalty and sincerity of your affection for me, which has been my comfort hitherto" (*Ep.* 227).

No one could live in his friends more intimately than St. John Chrysostom ; he had not a monk's spirit of detachment in such severity as to be indifferent to the presence, the handwriting, the doings, the welfare, soul and body, of those who were children of the same grace with him, and heirs of the same promise. He writes as if he considered, that the more religious a man is, the more sensitive he will be of a separation from his friends in religion ; and, by the very topics

which he uses in handling the subject of bereavement, in one of his letters to Olympias, he betrays his own acute suffering under the trial. The passage is too long to quote, but I may attempt an abstract of it.

It is not a light effort, he says (*Ep.* 2), but it demands an energetic soul and a great mind to bear separation from one whom we love in the charity of Christ. Every one knows this who knows what it is to love sincerely, who knows the power of supernatural love. Take the blessed Paul: here was a man who had stripped himself of the flesh, and who went about the world almost with a disembodied soul, who had exterminated from his heart every wild impulse, and who imitated the passionless serenity of the immaterial intelligences, and who stood on high with the Cherubim, and shared with them in their mystical music, and bore prisons, chains, transportations, scourges, stoning, shipwreck, and every form of suffering; yet he, when separated from one soul loved by him in Christian charity, was so confounded and distracted as all at once to rush out of that city, in which he did not find the beloved one whom he expected. "When I was come to Troas," he says, "for the gospel of Christ, and a door was opened to me in the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but bidding them farewell, I went into Macedonia."

Is it Paul who says this? (he continues;) Paul who, even when fastened in the stocks, when confined in a dungeon, when torn with the bloody scourge, did nevertheless convert and baptise and offer sacrifice, and was chary even of one soul which was seeking salvation? and now, when he has arrived at Troas, and sees the field cleansed of weeds, and ready for the sowing, and the floor full, and ready to his hand, suddenly he flings away the profit, though he came thither expressly for it. "So it was," he answers me, "just so; I was possessed by a predominating tyranny of sorrow, for Titus was away; and this so wrought upon me as to compel me to this course." Those who have the grace of charity are not content to be united in soul only, they seek for the personal presence of him they love.

Turn once more to this scholar of charity, and you will find that so it is. "We, brethren," he says, "being bereaved of you for the time of an hour, in sight, not in heart, have hastened the more abundantly to see your face with great desire. For we would have come unto you, I, Paul, indeed, once and again, but Satan hath hindered us. For which cause, forbearing no longer, we thought it good to remain at Athens alone, and we sent Timothy." What force is there



in each expression ! That flame of charity living in his soul is manifested with singular luminousness. He does not say so much as "separated from you," nor "torn," nor "divided," nor "abandoned," but only "bereaved;" moreover, not "for a certain period," but merely "for the time of an hour;" and separated, "not in heart, but in presence only;" again, "have hastened the more abundantly to see your face." What ! it seems charity so captivated you, that you desiderated their sight, you longed to gaze upon their earthly, fleshly countenance ? "Indeed I did," he answers : "I am not ashamed to say so ; for in that seeing all the channels of the senses meet together. I desire to see your presence ; for there is the tongue which utters sounds and announces the secret feelings ; there is the hearing which receives words, and there the eyes which image the movements of the soul." But this is not all : not content with writing to them letters, he actually sends to them Timothy, who was with him, and who was more than any letters. And, "We thought it good to remain alone;" that is, when he is divided from one brother, he says he is left alone, though he had so many others with him.

The tone of this passage certainly makes it clear that, when the Saint so eagerly calls on his friends for letters, it is for his own sake, in order to supply, as best he may, the severe deprivation—the *pæna damni*, as it is called—which his absence from them caused him. However, there was obviously another reason for his wishing to hear news about them of a different kind, at a time when so many friends of his were, as being his friends, under the stroke of a severe persecution. This feeling is expressed in the following letter :

*To Briso.*

"Near seventy days I passed on my journey, haunted on many sides with fear of the Isaurians, and fighting with intolerable fever ; at length I reached Cucusus, the most desolate place in the whole world. I say this, not wishing you to be troublesome to any one in your attempts to effect my removal, for I have suffered my worst in suffering the hardship of the journey ; but I ask you this favour, to write to me frequently, without allowing my distance from you to act in depriving me at least of this solace. For you know how great a comfort it is to me, however afflicted or badly circumstanced I may be, to hear how you are, who love me so well ; to hear that you are in good spirits, and in health, and at your ease. As you would have me, then, on this score light of heart, write to me word of this frequently, for it will be no common restorative. You know well what joy I feel in your prosperity" (*Ep.* 234).

To enumerate the sufferings of his friends would be to

write the history of the years to which his banishment belongs. Two Bishops who had sided with him, on pretence of their being concerned in the fire which consumed the cathedral and senate-house, upon his crossing to Bithynia, were first imprisoned, and then sent into banishment. One of his lectors, a delicate youth, was, on the same charge, put on the rack, torn with hooks, scourged, and then scorched with torches till he died. Tigrius, of whom mention was made in a former chapter, was scourged and racked, and then banished. Somewhat later, the persecution embraced all those who would not communicate with the Bishops who were successively intruded into the see of Constantinople. An imperial rescript determined that any Bishop who would not communicate with the usurper should lose his property, and be cast into exile. "Those who were rich," says Fleury, "and cared for their estates, communicated with Atticus out of policy; and those who were poor and weak in the faith suffered themselves to be seduced by bribes. But there were others who nobly disregarded their riches, their country, and all temporal advantages, and fled to escape the persecution. Several of them repaired to Rome, and others retired to the mountains, or into monasteries. The edict against the laity ordained that whosoever was invested with any dignity should be dispossessed of it; that officers and military men should be broken, and the rest of the people and tradesmen condemned to pay a large fine, and banished. Notwithstanding these menaces, the people who were faithful to St. Chrysostom, rather than communicate with Atticus, used to pray in the open air, exposed to many inconveniences."\*

In this way, Cyriacus, Bishop of Emesa, was sent off to Persia, Palladius to Syene, Demetrius to the Oasis; the soldiers who conducted them treating them with great indignity and cruelty. Serapion, Bishop of Heraclea, who had made himself especially obnoxious to the schismatical party, was scourged, tortured, and banished. Hilarius, an ancient ascetic, was scourged, and banished to the furthest part of Pontus. The priests were sent away as far as to Arabia, Mesopotamia, the Thebaid, and Africa. Stephen, a monk, was scourged, imprisoned, and then banished to Pelusium. The holy women who took part with the Saint, whether in Constantinople or elsewhere, had, at an earlier date, a share in the sufferings of his cause. Olympias especially, in spite of her high birth and connections, was summoned before the prefect of the imperial city, and was heavily fined. She withdrew to Cyzicus. Pentadia, another deaconess, widow of a man who

\* Book xxii. 9, Oxford translation.

had filled the consulate, was fined and imprisoned. Nicarete had to leave the city.

It is not surprising that outrages so extreme should have filled Chrysostom, not only with horror, but with the most cruel anxiety what was next to happen; and should have made him eager to learn from his correspondents the course of events without any delay. We have various letters of his, written to Bishops and others under persecution; in others he makes application in their behalf in powerful quarters, and on their liberation from prison he sends about the news of it. His exhortations to them are characteristic of the writer. He calls them "champions who are nobly fighting for the peace of the world" (*Ep.* 148). And he realises what it is to be a champion. He understands well that their prison was not merely a building, or a chamber, or a courtyard with a strong door to it, an honourable confinement, or the *surveillance* of an officer: "You are the inmates of a prison," he writes; "you are encompassed with chains, shut up with foul and filthy men. Who, then, can be more blessed than you? What have bright and spacious mansions to compare in value with that murky, filthy, fetid, and tormenting prison, undergone for God's sake?" (*Ep.* 118). And he entreats them not to lose heart, but "day by day to prosecute their labours for the churches of the world, that there may be such a settlement of matters as is suitable, and no abandonment of their cause because of their being so few and so baited on every side" (*Ep.* 174).

He set the example himself of what he preached; he never thought of dispensing himself from the ordinary oversight of his church, so far as it was possible, even though he had been removed, as he says, to the extremity of the Roman world. He had thoughts to bestow even on the remissness of individual ecclesiastics at Constantinople. Several of his letters are devoted to the case of two of his priests, who, whether from fear of the court or other reason, had during his absence seldom preached or been present at the public devotions. "It has given me no common pain," he writes to one of them, "that both you and the priest Theophilus should have relaxed in your duties. I have been informed that one of you has only preached five homilies up to October, and the other none at all. This news has tried me more than my desolate state here. Please to tell me, then, if I am mistaken; if not, make a reformation. How are you excusable if, at a time when others are in persecution, sent into exile, and variously harassed, you neither by your presence nor your teaching exert yourselves for your distressed people?"

(*Ep.* 203.) He sends equally strong remonstrances to Theophilus. "Now," he says, "is the very time for glory and much gain. The merchant does not get together his cargo by sitting down in harbour, but by venturing across open seas" (*Ep.* 119). And he writes to a friend to complain of his not having been told the state of things. "I am informed," he says, "that the one from indolence, the other from cowardice, has not attended the sacred assembly. To Theophilus I have written severely; Sallust I refer to you, for I know, and am pleased to know, how much you are attached to him. And I am pained that you have not even informed me, much less set him right, as you should have done. Now I beg you to do both yourself and me the great kindness of giving him a startling notice, and not to suffer him to sleep or to be idle. For if he does not show becoming courage in our present tempestuous weather, what good will he be to us when calm and peace succeed?" (*Ep.* 210.)

While he thus kept his eyes on his clergy at home, he was exemplifying the same zeal for the conversion of the heathen which we have seen in him at Nicæa. At that time he had been busying himself in the extension of religion in Phœnicia; and though Cucusus was, as he says, at the extremity of the empire, it was on that very account only the more central place for missionary enterprises in the wide range of countries which bordered upon it. As to Phœnicia, he obtained funds for the missionaries, he sent relics for their new churches, he encouraged them to perseverance in persecution, and he provided them with fresh labourers. One of his letters is a recommendation to a friend of a holy priest, who had succeeded in converting the pagans of Mount Amanus,—the Black Mountain, between himself and Antioch,—and had built churches and monasteries among them. He interested himself also in the conversion of the Goths, who at that time were on the left bank of the Don, and still adhered to their nomad habits. He endeavoured to secure them a successor to their Bishop, who was lately dead; and he wrote to some Goths in a monastery at Constantinople on the subject. He enters upon it in that letter to Olympias in which he details the sufferings of his journey. Those sufferings, however keen, had no power to divert his mind for however short a time from the apostolical duties of his Patriarchate. In the same letter he also speaks of the prospect which was then opening of the conversion of the Persians, and makes mention of St. Maruthas, who was at the time doing so much for the extension of the faith among them. Maruthas, from misinformation, had allied himself with the enemies of St. Chrysostom; and

the latter was very desirous both to gain him and to forward his work. He had written two letters to Maruthas, without getting an answer; and as the zealous missionary was at this time at Constantinople, he wrote to Olympias to make acquaintance with him. "Do not fail," he says, "to show all the attention in your power to the Bishop Maruthas, in order to draw him out of that pit. I have the greatest need of him for the affairs of Persia; and learn from him, if you can, what success he has had there" (*Ep.* 14). He did not forget, in these more expansive thoughts, the welfare of the poor people who were his immediate neighbours. We have seen him refusing sums of money when offered to him by friends; one of the channels into which he contrived to divert their liberality was the supply of the wants of the poor round about him, especially during a famine which happened while he was at Cucusus. He also redeemed from slavery many who had been taken captive by the Isaurian robbers, and sent them to their homes.

Amid these various exercises of faith and piety he had not been neglectful of the duties of the cause for which he suffered banishment. It was incumbent upon him to rouse Christendom in his own behalf, and he had been prompt and earnest in doing so. We have letters written by him to the Bishops of Thessalonica, Corinth, Synnada, Laodicea, Mopsuestia, Jerusalem, Carthage, Milan, Brescia, and Aquileia. Above all, he addressed himself to the Holy See, and his friends zealously prosecuted the appeal which he initiated. Many of them had fled to Rome; and though Pope Innocent did not at once decide on the main points at issue between the Saint and his enemies, yet he had no scruple in acknowledging him and communicating with him as Bishop of Constantinople, and by consequence in rejecting the pretensions of the schismatical party which had taken possession of his see. Innocent could do no more at the moment; but it was easy to prophesy what his ultimate determination would be. Every thing then seemed turning out in the Saint's favour; his reputation, his celebrity, his influence, had been greatly increased by the measures which his enemies had taken to ruin him. He was doing greater things at Cucusus than he had done at Constantinople. Debarred from the exercise of his special gift, his eloquent voice, he moved more forcibly the hearts of men by his very absence from the scene of the world; and he had the opportunity of showing how little he depended on the breath of popular favour, how much on himself and on his God, for that vigour and energy which had been the characteristics of his public life.

Habitually sanguine, he shared the belief of his friends that the triumph of his cause was at hand. As he had no resentments in respect to his persecutors, so he had no misgivings about his coming victory over them ; and if his hopefulness forfeits for him the praise of prophecy, it evinces the more excellent grace of patience and trust. He was as easy about the future at Cucusus as he had been at Nicæa. He writes to Olympias thus :

“ I do not despair of happier times, considering that He is at the helm of the universe who overcomes the storm, not by human skill, but by His *fiat*. If He does not do so at once, this is because it is His rule to take this course ; and, when evils have increased and reached their fullness, and a change is despaired of by the many, then to work His marvellous and strange work, manifesting that power which is His prerogative, while exercising withal the endurance of the afflicted. Never be cast down, then ; for one thing alone is fearful, that is, sin” (*Ep.* 1).

Again :

“ Cherish a full conviction that you will see me again, and will be released from your present distress, and will receive the great gain, now as hitherto, which follows from it” (*Ep.* 2).

And still more strikingly in the following interesting and touching passage, which belongs to a later year of his exile :

“ I speak not for the sake of consoling you, but I know that so it absolutely shall be. For, unless it were so to be, long ago, as it seems to me, should I have departed hence, so far as the trials go which have come upon me. For, not to speak of all that I suffered in Constantinople, you may easily understand how many things have happened to me since I left the city, in my long and painful journey hitherto, most of which were enough to cause my death ; how many things after I arrived here, how many things after my dislodgment from Cucusus, how many things during my stay at Arabissus. Yet I got through them all, and am now in health and in all safety, to the astonishment of all the Armenians, that a frame so feeble, so spider-like, should be able to bear such unbearable cold, should be able to breathe in it, when even those who are accustomed to sharp winters are seriously affected by it. Nevertheless I have remained unharmed even to this day, and have escaped the hands of brigands in their many inroads ; and have been preserved amid want of the necessaries of life, and without even a bath to recruit me, although when I was in Constantinople I had constant need of one ; yet here I have found my state of body such that I have not even had a desire for this refreshment, and have been all the healthier. And no insalubrity of air, nor desolateness of place, nor absence of stores, nor scarcity of drugs, nor unskilfulness of physicians, nor difficulty of baths, nor absolute confinement, or rather imprisonment, in one

room, nor want of exercise, which was always necessary to me, nor my atmosphere of smoke, nor alarms of robbers, nor the state of siege, nor any other hardship, has availed to destroy me ; but I am in better health here than I was with you, though I then took such care of myself. Think over all this, and shake off the despondency with which my trial has oppressed you, and give over your needless and painful self-inflictions" (*Ep.* 4).

And then he goes on to bid her read a treatise which he sends her, and which has for its title the noble maxim, "Be true to yourself, and no one can harm you."

And here I pause in my sketch of the last years of this many-gifted saint, this most natural and human of the creations of supernatural grace. O.

## ON THE SIGNS OF MARTYRDOM IN THE CATACOMBS.

M. LE BLANT begins his remarks on the subject of the present article by saying that it is *pleine de péril pour qui veut l'aborder*. On the other hand, it is full of interest ; and the time seems to be now arrived for a full and candid examination of the question which it involves. Only let those who take part in the examination do so with moderation and prudence ; let them think of themselves as being "debtors both to the wise and to the unwise," abstain from all positive assertion where the evidence is only doubtful, and treat with becoming gentleness the hereditary belief of past generations, even where modern scientific research may have proved it to be erroneous. It is in this spirit at least that I desire to offer the following contribution towards the elucidation of the question at issue ; a contribution which is not made without some misgivings and reluctance, and of which I may truly say, as the Jesuit Ferrandi said two centuries ago of his treatise on a kindred subject: *Meis e manibus non sine aliquâ nonnullorum prece, dicam extortum an exoratum?* I would add, however, with the same learned and conscientious writer: *Serviendum est multorum votis, concedendum est aliquid amicorum hortatibus, dandum aliquid publicæ utilitati.*

Nothing is more clearly written in the pages of ecclesiastical history than the exceeding care of the early Christians in all that concerned the martyrs of the Church. Scribes or notaries were appointed by the Sovereign Pontiffs for the several parishes or regions of the city of Rome, who should collect their *Acts* ; and notices abound, both of clergy and laity,

men and women, who spared no expenditure either of time or money—nay, even risked life itself—to honour their bodies with a becoming burial. Indeed, this was so general and notorious, that even the heathen themselves were aware of it, and used every means which the most diabolical malice could suggest to frustrate this holy purpose of the Christians. I need not quote a number of examples\* in detail to prove what cannot be unknown even to the veriest tyro in the study of Christian archæology. I may be allowed, however, briefly to refer to the statement of St. Ambrose with reference to the bodies of Vitalis and Agricola,†—a master and his servant, in the north of Italy, who fell under the persecution of Diocletian,—that they were buried among the sepulchres of the Jews, *that their fellow-Christians might not know them.* It is clear from this (and from several other examples which could be adduced) that one great object of the Church's solicitude in this matter concerned something that she desired to have done with the bodies of the martyrs even after their burial. She was anxious, not only that they should receive the rites of sepulture, but also that she should know the place of their burial. And the reason of this is made manifest by the practice of the Church when she had that knowledge. Prudentius, speaking of the tomb of the martyr Hippolytus, describes the multitudes whose devotion led them to frequent it in the following words:

“ Mane salutatum concurritur ; omnis adorat  
Pubes ; eunt, redeunt, solis ad usque obitum.”

And in another hymn, speaking of the sand which had been saturated with the blood of the martyrs Emiterius and Chelidonius, he says:‡

“ Incolæ  
Frequentant observantes  
Voce, votis, munere ;  
Externi, necnon et orbis  
Huc colonus advenit.”

We see, then, that the graves of the martyrs, and all places consecrated by their blood, were an object of tender devotion to the early Christians ; so that it seems impossible but that they must have had some means of distinguishing in a general cemetery the tomb of a martyr from the tombs of ordinary Christians. Of course there would be no risk of forgetting the tombs of the more celebrated martyrs,—of those who had occupied a prominent position in the Church during their lifetime, such as Bishops, priests, or deacons, or members of noble families, or persons who had suffered extraordinary tor-

\* Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv. 14, v. 1, viii. 6.

† Epist. lib. vii. 55.

‡ Peristeph. Hymn 1.



ments, or died under some other peculiar circumstances. But where martyrdoms were so frequent as to be in fact innumerable,—where men, women, and children of every rank suffered indiscriminately together,—the memory of so many graves could not be safely trusted to mere local tradition; it could only be retained by certain plain and definite signs. Such at least, as it appears to me, is a very natural and reasonable conclusion to draw from the facts which have been mentioned; and if it be objected that there is no distinct historical evidence testifying to the use of these marks of distinction, I would point to the words of St. Ambrose, when he is relating to his sister the discovery of the bodies of SS. Gervasius and Protasius. After having mentioned the spot where he had ordered excavations to be made, he says, “*Inveni signa convenientia* ;”\* and then presently describes the condition in which he found the bodies, as though these *signa convenientia* had been something exterior to the grave, yet very near it. We must not forget, however, that this was not spoken of graves in the Catacombs of Rome. A passage in Prudentius, which is often quoted in connection with this subject, seems more to the point, topographically at least, for it certainly refers to Rome and to the Catacombs of Rome; and if once it could be established by other arguments or testimony, that a martyr’s grave was always distinguished from others by some token connected with the shedding of blood, no commentator would hesitate for a moment to recognise an allusion to this practice in the following lines from the hymn in honour of St. Laurence :

“ Vix fama nota est abditis  
Quam plena Sanctis Roma sit ;  
Quam dives urbanum solum  
Sacris sepulcris floreat.  
Sed qui caremus his bonis,  
*Nec sanguinis vestigia*  
*Videre coram possumus,*  
Cœlum intuemur eminens.”

However, be this as it may, it is certainly not to be wondered at, that, when the Catacombs were rediscovered towards the close of the sixteenth century, the devotion of Catholics should seek with eagerness for the tombs of those heroes of the Christian faith who had laid down their lives in its defence, and that they should expect to find some distinguishing mark upon them. It is equally to be expected, perhaps, that, in the absence of any certain tradition, their ignorance and inexperience should betray them, at first and for a while, into

\* Epist. lib. vii. 54.

some errors. It is with the history of these errors, or of one them, that we are now concerned.

Mabillon\* denies that either the cross, the monogram, the heart, the dove, or the lamb (any of them taken singly, or all together) constituted a sure sign of martyrdom; and Fortunato Scacchi, the Augustinian and Pope's sacristan, had said the same thing fifty years before.† It is much to be regretted that these writers should have so expressed themselves as to convey the impression that, at some time or other, the Church had thought otherwise, and had been in the habit of extracting bodies from the Catacombs, as though they were the bodies of martyrs, merely upon the faith of these emblems. Indeed, in another place, Mabillon, misled by false information and writing anonymously,‡ expressly affirmed that she had done so; but in a second edition of his work he retracted the false accusation. It is not surprising, therefore, that anti-Catholic writers should have taken advantage of these authorities to repeat the charge; though, in truth, it seems never to have had any foundation in fact. I find, indeed, a Bishop,§ in the middle of the seventeenth century, who understood the monogram XP to be an abbreviation of the words "Pro Christo," and therefore to be a sign of martyrdom; and I have heard an ecclesiastic, conducting strangers through the Catacombs, repeat the same error: but these persons not being in authority, their private erroneous opinion in noway affected the practice of the Church, nor was it derived from it. Thus, at the very time that the Bishop of whom I have spoken, who was Vicegerent of Rome under Urban VIII., was writing his work, we have the evidence of the Jesuit Fathers, examined by order of the Cardinal-Vicar as to the authenticity of the relics in possession of their General; and part of this evidence affects the question on which we are engaged. At that time the Popes were in the habit of granting to different individuals or religious communities special privileges to enter the Catacombs, and extract from them whatever objects of interest or religious veneration they found there. The Jesuits amongst others had availed themselves of a privilege of this kind, and extracted largely from the Catacomb of Sta. Priscilla, as it was then called, a considerable portion of which lay under one of their own vineyards. They were asked what signs or emblems they had trusted as certain proofs of martyrdom; and their answer was very distinct and positive, that

\* *Iter Italicum*, tom. i. p. 138.

† *De Cult. et Vener. Serv. Dei*, sect. ix. c. 2, ed. 1639.

‡ *Epist. Euseb. Rom.*

§ *Ant. Ricciul. Lucubr. Eccl. lib. i. c. xxxi. n. 10*, ed. 1643.

they had removed no bodies which were not found in graves, either (1) with axes, heads of spears, leaden scourges, *ungulae*, or other instruments of torture; or (2) with an *ampulla*, or some glass or earthen vessel, stained with blood; or (3) with a palm-branch engraved on the tombstone, or rudely scratched in the mortar which secured it. Here, then, we have three signs whereby the Church at that time, or at least one of the most distinguished religious bodies in the Church, professed to recognise the tombs of the martyrs. Of course it is very possible that less learned or less scrupulous persons may have admitted a larger number of tests; but time and space forbid us to pursue our inquiries any further in this direction. And it is not necessary, since all these private faculties were subsequently annulled by Clement XI., who desired to reserve so important a matter more immediately to himself; and his successor, Clement XII., made a decree on the 13th of January 1672, intrusting the care of all the Catacombs to the Cardinal-Vicar of Rome. Henceforward uniformity of practice in the recognition of relics taken from the Catacombs was effectually secured; and the rule by which it was governed is thus expressed in the decree of a commission specially appointed for the purpose in 1668:\*

“Upon the question of the signs by which the genuine relics of the holy martyrs can be distinguished from false and doubtful ones, the same Sacred Congregation, after diligent examination, expressed its opinion that the palm-branch and the vessel coloured with their blood should be considered as certain marks; the discussion of other signs it deferred to a future day.”

Already one of the three tokens which in 1628 had been accepted by the Jesuits as certain and trustworthy, is abandoned, or at least passed over in silence, and thereby branded as doubtful, viz. instruments of martyrdom found in the grave. The reason of this decision is not given; perhaps the commission considered that sufficient care had not been taken, or that it was almost impossible to decide with certainty in some cases, whether or not the objects found in the grave had really been used as instruments of torture. On the one hand, we have the express testimony of St. Ambrose that he found the wood of the cross on which St. Agricola had been crucified close to his tomb, and nails in the grave of St. Vitalis,—nails from which he says the holy martyr had received “more wounds than there were limbs in his body;” and it seems certain that it was by no means uncommon to bury the instruments of martyrdom with the body itself. On the other

\* It has already appeared in the *Rambler* for January in this year (vol. ii. p. 201); but for the sake of clearness it is better to reproduce it.

hand, Mr. Northcote mentions in his account of the Christian museums in Rome, that some of the objects preserved there as having been taken from the graves of martyrs in Catacombs, "look more like domestic utensils, and seem to be of Etruscan workmanship." However, we need not trouble ourselves any further with the reasons of the decision; the fact itself is what really concerns us, and is of importance, that the decree of the Commission in 1668 set aside one of the tokens which had been accepted and acted upon forty years before by the Jesuits, and itself laid down two, "after diligent examination," as being "most certain,"—the palm-branch and the vessel coloured with blood. This decree, however, did not meet with universal acceptance. Mabillon\* continually denied that the palm-branch was any sign of martyrdom; Papebroch, Scacchi, Ricciul, Fabretti, Arevalo, and many others, both before and since his days, were of the same opinion; until at length Benedict XIV., in his great work upon the Beatification and Canonisation of Saints,† subscribed to the same judgment; and henceforth the blood-stained *ampulla* alone was received as the unequivocal token of martyrdom.

It is scarcely necessary to examine in detail the objections that were urged against the palm-branch as a certain token; for, as in the former case, so here also, the main fact that concerns us is not so much the correctness or otherwise of the decision come to, but rather the fact that the Holy See did not hesitate to abandon its own previous rule and practice, when, after more diligent examination, it saw good reason for doing so. I may mention, however, *en passant*, that some of the objections might have been, and by some authors were, as strongly urged against the *ampulla* as against the palm-branch; and yet most, if not all, of these authors never seem to have doubted about the one sign, whilst they loudly condemned the other. It was said, for instance, about the palm-branch, that it was often found on the same grave with the words "*in pace*," which were supposed to exclude the possibility of a cruel and bloody death. It was answered, in the words of Holy Scripture,‡ that "though the martyrs seemed to suffer torments, and their departure was taken for misery, yet they are in peace;" and instances

\* Euseb. Rom. p. 17, ed. Paris, 1705.

† The remark does not appear in the edition of his work published in 1738, whilst he was Cardinal Lambertini; but I find it in the Roman edition of 1749, book iv. part ii. c. 27. Cornelius à Lapide (ad Heb. x. 38) acknowledges, Muratori (Antiq. Ital. tom. v. p. 33) rejects, the palm as a sign of martyrdom.

‡ Wisdom iii. 2, 3.

were quoted in which persons were said to have died in peace who yet were slain in battle, or in other ways met with their death by violence.\* Or again, it was objected that the palm-branch was often found on the graves of very young children, even of mere infants. It was answered, that it was by God's own appointment, that "out of the mouth of infants and of sucklings He has perfected praise;" that the very first martyrs were the Holy Innocents, of whom St. Peter Chrysologus says, "*moriuntur. inconscii, ignari tollunt palmas, coronas rapiunt ignorantes;*" that Eusebius† tells us of men and women, and even little children, who fell under the persecution in Egypt; that Dionysius of Alexandria‡ says the same; and moreover, that it has been seen even in modern times (*e.g.* in the martyrdoms of Japan) how a bitter hatred of the Christian name can so far overcome man's natural instincts of humanity as to cause him to imbrue his hands in the blood of innocent young children.

We come, lastly, to the *ampulla* found outside many of the graves in the Catacombs, and supposed to contain blood shed in martyrdom by the person buried therein. A correspondent in the last *Rambler*,§ signing himself "J. P.," says that he is in a position to affirm, that ever since the close of the sixteenth century "there has been a *catena* of most learned men who had but small confidence in the genuineness of the *corpi santi* extracted from the Catacombs, because they doubted of the sufficiency . . . of the so-called phials of blood which were usually found at the head of the graves, to prove the martyrdom of the tenant of the tomb." I am somewhat surprised at this statement, and it certainly does not tally with the impression left on my own mind by all I have been able to read on the matter. Benedict XIV. says distinctly that no one has ever doubted of this sign. However, "J. P." is evidently perfectly familiar with his subject, and he has had an advantage which I have not had, of reading the work printed in Brussels in 1855, of which he speaks, and whose title is *De Phialis rubricatis, quibus Martyrum Romanorum sepulchra dignosci dicuntur observationes V. D. B.* Doubtless there have been learned Protestants who have entertained grave doubts on the trustworthiness of this token; but then they can scarcely be considered fair judges on such a topic, since their learning is more than outweighed by their prejudice. Neither, again, is the authority of such a writer as Raoul-Rochette of much weight towards forming even a single link

\* 4 Kings xxii. 20, xxiii. 29. On the other hand, cf. 3 Kings ii. 6; Jeremias xxxiv. 4, &c.

† Hist. Eccl. viii. 9.

‡ Ibid. vii. 10.

§ Vol. iii. p. 114.

of this *catena*; and for myself, I am really unable to quote others. I should have said that the weight of authority was, previous at least to our own times, altogether on the side of the authenticity of the *ampulla*, even though learned writers, like Muratori, Marini, Mai, and others, have occasionally found some difficulty in admitting it in this or that particular instance. Quite recently, however, this question has assumed a very different aspect; and it is desirable that well-instructed Catholics should understand whence this has arisen, and what effect has been thereby produced, both in theory and practice. We will first call a witness, or advocate rather, on each side of the question, and then briefly adding some comments of our own, together with the most authentic information within our reach, state the conclusion in which we believe all the most learned antiquarians of Rome are now agreed on this very important question.

Our advocate in favour of the *ampulla* shall be "C.," the careful and conscientious writer of an article on the subject in the *Rambler* of last January; his opponent, Monsieur Edmond Le Blant, author of a very short *brochure* entitled *La Question du Vase de Sang*, of which only one hundred copies, I believe, were printed in Paris, two or three years ago, and one presented to each member of the Academy.

Before comparing these two authors, however, it will be necessary to make a distinction which is very generally overlooked in the examination of this question. There are, in fact, two separate points to be considered: first, whether the phials ever really contained blood; secondly, whether that blood was of the person buried in the grave to which the phial was attached, and was intended to be a token of his martyrdom.

To establish the first of these points, "C." alleges arguments of three different kinds,—historical, monumental, and chemical: First, that passage from the hymn of Prudentius in honour of St. Laurence, which has been already quoted, and characterised as indistinct and inconclusive, though decidedly favourable to "C.'s" view of the case. Secondly, the letters SA, or SA N G, rudely scratched on the mortar in which some few of these vessels were originally fastened; but this is unfortunately now acknowledged to be a forgery,—at least so Padre Garrucci assures us, both on his own judgment of the calligraphy and other tokens, and also on the strength of other arguments, to be by and by adduced, by the Cavaliere de' Rossi; \* and where these two great authorities are agreed, there is little danger of their sentence being reversed by any appeal to a higher tribunal. Lastly, "C." relies on the test of

\* Hagioglypta a Joanne Macario, p. 107.

a chemical analysis undertaken by the Protestant philosopher Leibnitz, at the request of the antiquarian and *custode* of the Roman Catacombs, Fabretti; and this has certainly very great weight, especially considering the source from which it comes. It is to be observed, however, that Leibnitz expresses himself with great caution and reserve: "*Nata nobis meritò suspicio est, sanguineam potius materiam quàm terrestrem esse.*" Dr. Maitland, indeed, and some other modern writers, have insinuated that "the experiments instituted by Leibnitz are far from being satisfactory to the modern practical chemist;" but he altogether overlooks the fact, which to my mind is perhaps the strongest proof of all, as to the contents of these phials, viz. that in many of them the blood has actually been found in a fresh and liquid state. Arringhi tells us that it had happened again and again (*sæpe sæpius*), in the presence of many witnesses, that, in attempting to detach the vase from the strong mass of cement in which it was embedded, the vase had been broken (which it is often impossible to prevent), and liquid blood spilt upon the ground. Boldetti says that he had frequently seen one of these vessels with liquid blood, which had come from a tomb in the cemetery of Sta. Cyriaca, and was among the relics shown by the Jesuit Fathers at San Ignazio; but one day, whilst Boldetti was yet writing his book, it dropped from the hands of some one who was examining it, and was broken. Marangoni found one inside a grave in the cemetery of St. Thraso in which the watery portion of the blood floated on the surface, and the red portion had sunk to the bottom: when the vessel was shaken they mixed, but when it was at rest they again separated. He found another also outside a grave in the same cemetery; and both were preserved in his own house until the disastrous fire in 1737, which destroyed so many of his papers and other valuable relics connected with the Catacombs.

I cannot think it at all doubtful, then, but that these *ampullæ* really contained blood; and if blood, it is inconceivable that it should have been any thing else than the blood of martyrs. But what I question, or rather what "the stern logic of facts" now obliges all Roman antiquarians to question, is, whether the blood in the vase without the grave is of the tenant within the grave. "C." asserts this on the authority, as he supposes, of the best modern Christian antiquarians, Father Marchi (R.I.P.) and the Cav. de' Rossi. "J.P.," on the other hand, writing to the *Rambler* in May, and evidently with a very accurate knowledge of all the facts of the case, asserts that "De' Rossi is well known in Rome to entertain exactly the contrary opinion."

"C.'s" authority having failed him, we turn next to his arguments. He adduces a number of ancient testimonies; but I think a candid inquirer will be forced to acknowledge that for the most part they fall just short of the purpose for which "C." requires them. His opponent, the Edinburgh Reviewer, had said that "he found no allusion in contemporary writers to the practice of collecting the blood of dead martyrs in a bottle *to be placed in their graves.*" "C." quotes several passages from Prudentius showing that it was a very common practice of the early Christians to collect the blood shed by the martyrs in the midst of their torments; but all his testimonies, with one solitary exception, are silent as to the use to be afterwards made of the blood so collected; and *that* one assigns a somewhat different use from that which "C." desires to prove. It is said of the blood of St. Vincent that those who were present at his martyrdom collected it,


"Tutamen ut sacrum suis  
Domi reservent posteris."

It seems, then, that they desired to preserve this blood as a sacred treasure in their own homes, not that they might bury it at the martyr's tomb. And the original acts of his martyrdom\* tell us the same thing, almost in the same words: "*sanguinem linteis excipiunt, sacrâ veneratione posteris profuturum.*" However, it can scarcely be said, perhaps, that this use of the martyr's blood is altogether inconsistent with the other; so that if "C." has not succeeded in establishing his position, neither has his adversary succeeded in overthrowing it. The passages to which he refers in St. Ambrose would seem to tell much more strongly in his favour, if only the ancient Christian burial-places at Milan had at all resembled the Catacombs of Rome. I allude, of course, to that letter addressed to his brother Bishops and to all the faithful of Italy, concerning the finding of the bodies of SS. Vitalis and Agricola, in which he says "*collegimus sanguinem triumphalem;*" and again, writing to his sister about the bodies of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, "we found all the bones perfect, *sanguinis plurimum.*" However, not even this can be fairly alleged as proving any ancient practice of placing a phial of the martyr's blood outside his grave by way of a token to distinguish it from others'.

But it is time that we should hear the advocate on the other side. M. Le Blant's short pamphlet consists of little else than objections against the popular belief that the *ampulla* was an unequivocal sign of martyrdom. They are stated briefly and pointedly. I will first enumerate them, and then

\* Apud Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, tom. i. p. 731, ed. 1713.



comment on them. The first, on which he rightly lays the greatest stress, is simply chronological, and consists of these two items: (1) several of the graves, eight or nine perhaps, to which the vase was attached have inscriptions upon them with consular dates, and these belong to an epoch subsequent to the persecutions; (2) several others, nearly a hundred, are marked with the monogram , which the wisest antiquarians consider to have been decidedly posterior to the conversion of Constantine. Le Blant's second objection is of a more subtle kind. The Roman martyrology of Baronius, he says, gives the names of 311 men and only 73 women as having suffered martyrdom in the city,—and this must be taken as representing the real proportion between the two sexes in this particular; whereas, if the vase of blood be accepted as a true token of martyrdom, the numbers of the two sexes thus added to the calendar would be nearly equal. Thirdly, he observes that some of the graves on which this token is found are marked by inscriptions containing prayers for the deceased,—prayers for light, life, rest, and refreshment,—for which, according to the ordinary interpretation of the vase, there would have been no need; whilst others without this token express the most perfect confidence as to the deceased's happiness, *e.g.* “We know you to be in Christ;” “You live in the glory and peace of the Lord, in God,” &c. Fourthly, the epitaphs on many of these tombs are defaced by an enumeration of trifling details or most ordinary panegyrics, quite out of place in commemorating a martyr, and strikingly unlike the epitaphs of known and certain martyrs, which are always marked by a most exquisite simplicity, such as *Cornelius Martyr Ep., D.P. III. Idus Septembr.; Yacinthus Martyr, &c.* Nay, further still, some of them express even semi-pagan sentiments, and bear at their beginnings the old pagan formula, D.M. Fifthly, there is no vase found at the tombs of some persons who are yet known to have been martyrs, *e.g.* St. Cecilia, St. Cornelius, and St. Hyacinth. Sixthly, there is no mention of the practice in Prudentius or any other ancient author. Seventhly, Pope Gregory IV. in the middle of the ninth century wrote to a Bishop of Mayence, who had asked for the body of a martyr, saying that they had all been already removed from the Catacombs and appropriated to other churches; yet very many have continually been found ever since by means of this token, to which it is clear, therefore, that neither Gregory IV. nor Paschal attached any importance. Eighthly and lastly, it sometimes happens that

two, or even three, of these *ampullæ* are to be found attached to a single grave.

Even the most casual observer cannot fail to be struck with the unequal character of these objections; some are manifestly inconclusive, and the real student of the Roman Catacombs will find no great difficulty in disposing of most of them. Thus, to pass over for a while the first or chronological objection, who will recognise any great strength in the second? Indeed, I think the author would find it extremely difficult, not to say impossible, to prove the truth of his premisses in this argument, to say nothing of the legitimacy and then the relevancy of the conclusion. By far the larger portion of the graves marked by the *ampulla* are without epitaphs and anonymous; and unless we know the sex of all these nameless occupants of graves, we are scarcely in a position to enter upon such calculations as Le Blant has attempted. Then as to the objection that on some of the graves of these supposed martyrs are to be found prayers for the repose of their souls, as though their happiness was doubtful and needed our suffrages, what would M. Le Blant say to the following inscriptions, which are still to be seen in the Catacomb of SS. Nereus and Achilles?

. . . . VIBAS IN PACĒ ET PETE PRO NOBIS.

. . . . ΖΗΑΙC ΕΝ ΚΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΡΩΤΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΗΜΩΝ.\*

Is it possible that the persons to whom these epitaphs belonged were martyrs, or not? The survivors seem to pray for them; therefore it cannot be that they have entered on their eternal rest; but, on the other hand, the survivors also ask their prayers, and therefore they were confident about their happiness; and this could only be, or at least might have been, because they had laid down their lives for the faith. Certainly, if no stronger arguments than these can be urged against the decision of the Commission of 1668, it is not likely to be set aside; for it is not disproved—its credit is scarcely affected at all. But next, the epitaphs of these supposed martyrs are often defaced by unbecoming lamentations or very commonplace praises: a soldier enumerates the years of his military service; a widow records the exact length of her widowhood, and that she supported herself, and was not at the public charges of the Church; a husband praises his wife's sweetness of temper, that they had lived together without strife (*sine ullâ querelâ*), that she had borne him three children, that she lived thirty years, and had been married

\* Northcote's Roman Catacombs, p. 133, 2d edition.

so many years, four months, and fifteen days; but, spite of this particular enumeration of facts, of virtues, of days and months and years, not a hint is given of the deceased having enjoyed so high and glorious a privilege as to be added to the noble army of martyrs. No doubt there is an incongruity in this, yet not so absolute an inconsistency as to render the two things perfectly incompatible: the inconsistency is scarcely greater than that which Le Blant himself is obliged to admit in the case of certain epitaphs which distinctly unite in themselves pagan and Christian sentiments, and are of undoubted Christian origin, *e.g.* a declaration borrowed from the heathen, and expressed in heathen phraseology, that no man is immortal, followed by the Christian formula *in pace*. The world did not all at once abandon its ancient mode of thought and expression, and begin to speak with strict theological and devotional propriety, as soon as it was converted; such changes can only be perfected by the lapse of time. Neither will grace at any time altogether overcome and extinguish nature in all the members even of a most edifying Christian community: it is very possible to have a right and true appreciation of the glory of martyrdom, yet to be keenly alive to the loss we have ourselves suffered through the death of the martyred child or parent, husband or brother. The fifth objection of M. Le Blant rests on the absence of the vase from the graves of known martyrs, such as St. Cecilia, St. Cornelius, and St. Hyacinth; and on this I would observe, first, that negative argument is never very conclusive, especially when urged against a doctrine or practice that has been long in possession; but, secondly, that he has been singularly unfortunate in his choice of examples. St. Cecilia did not shed her blood in martyrdom precisely as other martyrs did. Her acts tell us that the executioner failed in his attempts to cut off her head. He inflicted deep wounds, and the bystanders reverently wiped the wounds with linen cloths, which were found in her tomb, deeply stained with blood, when Pope Paschal I. removed her body from the Catacombs in the early part of the ninth century, and again when her tomb was reopened in the time of Clement VIII. But the saint quietly resigned her life three days after the attempt at decapitation, and then her body was not laid in a simple shroud, and deposited on one of the shelves (so to call them) in the galleries of the Catacombs, after the ordinary manner, but it was enclosed in a rough coffin of cypress-wood, and buried with special honour by Pope Urban near to the burial-place of the Popes themselves. There were peculiar reasons, then, in this case which may have interfered with the usual practice in re-


ference to the *ampulla* at the graves of martyrs. The tomb of St. Cornelius too is a manifest exception to the common rule of burial in the Catacombs. Mr. Northcote tells us that the tomb is not a simple shelf like the others, but quite a large deep vault with an arched roof; and this because he did not die at Rome, but at Civita Vecchia, whence his body was brought to Rome, and interred in the cemetery of St. Callixtus, by the private devotion of some noble Roman lady. But, lastly, there was no *ampulla* found at the grave of St. Hyacinth. I am not quite so certain about this, but I have not the work of Father Marchi at hand to resolve my doubt. However, this I know, that his bones were found partly burnt to a cinder, and all having manifestly been subjected to the action of fire. In the absence, then, of any genuine acts of his martyrdom, we are at liberty to conclude that he suffered death by fire, and not by the sword; and in this way the non-appearance of any *ampulla* is satisfactorily accounted for. M. Le Blant's sixth argument, based on the silence of contemporary writers, has been sufficiently examined before; and the seventh and eighth need not detain us long. It is easy to answer, with reference to the letter of Gregory IV., that he was speaking of the more famous martyrs whose praises were in all the churches, not of those "hidden saints" of whom Prudentius speaks, and with whose sepulchres he testifies that the Roman soil abounds; and as to two or more of these *ampullæ* being found at the same grave, we know also that two or more persons, and even two or more martyrs, were often buried in the same grave, and perhaps the plurality of vases without the grave might only be intended to indicate the number of tenants within: but even were it otherwise, I do not see how the fact can really be made to tell as an objection for the end proposed.

My readers, if any have been patient enough to follow me through this long examination of the reasoning of M. Le Blant's pamphlet, may be somewhat perplexed as to the drift of my argument. They know that I am going to maintain that the vase of blood is not a sure sign of martyrdom, and yet I have been seeking to refute or throw discredit on every argument urged by Le Blant in behalf of the same conclusion. Nevertheless, I have not been arguing without a purpose, and one which I think my readers will appreciate as soon as they recognise it. It is briefly this: that if so large a proportion of the facts and arguments which learned men can find to object to the Roman practice of the last two centuries, or century and a half, with reference to the extraction of relics from the Catacombs, be so easily disposed of, it cannot

justly be made a subject of reproach to the Holy See that it should have steadfastly persevered in the course once laid down by competent authority, and always continued to act on a decision against which it was easy indeed to urge specious objections, but which could not be overthrown by any demonstrative evidence, nor even its fallacy exposed with any thing like a high degree of moral probability. A few years ago, Rome could truly speak in the face of the whole world upon this question, by the mouth of one of its learned antiquarians, who was discussing another subject;\* “Every body knows that Rome proceeds to the recognition of *corpi santi* in accordance with certain rules; and though even some good Catholics have thought that these rules have not a perfectly solid and immovable foundation, yet no one, up to the present moment, has been able to prove that they are false or founded on error.” Matters, however, are now changed, and with it the practice of the Holy See has changed. New facts have been discovered, which not only are valuable and important in themselves as bearing on the question at issue, but also throw a flood of light on other facts, known before, but not appreciated at their real value, because of themselves they were not sufficient warrant for any new conclusion.

The reader will remember that in our review of M. Le Blant’s arguments we passed over the first. It was the only one in which there was any real force, and which it was difficult to gainsay. He urged, as many had done before him, that some few of the graves to which the vase of blood was attached have inscriptions upon them with consular dates, and these dates belonged to an epoch subsequent to the persecutions. To this it had been always answered, that so long as any of the noble families of Rome, or even any considerable portion of the people, clung to the hereditary superstitions of their country, they would look with extreme jealousy upon the progress of the Christian faith, and never lose any opportunity that might present itself of wreaking their vengeance on individuals professing it; that, as it sometimes happened, during the reign of some of the more tolerant heathen emperors, that the chief magistrates or popular mobs took advantage of the emperor’s absence, or of some public tumult, to carry into execution penal laws which lay unrepealed in the statute-book, so it might well happen in later times also, as during the reign of Julian or on other occasions, that there was some partial outbreak of the pagan hatred of Christianity, to which these particular individuals whose

\* P. Garrucci, S.J., in his dissertations on the *Tre Sepolcri appartenenti al culto del Bacco Sabazio*, &c. Naples, 1852.

martyrdom was called in question had fallen victims. No one can pretend that this answer was not valid and legitimate, so long as these supposed martyrs were very few in number; and I think Le Blant himself only enumerates eight or nine. But the case is widely different when their number is multiplied tenfold; the class has then become at once too large to be treated as exceptional; and this was done by the decision lately cometo, on very irrefragable proofs, as to the precise chronology of the famous monogram . It had been disputed for years or rather for generations or ages, whether this symbol owed its origin to the celebrated vision of Constantine, or had been in private use among Christians long before. The indefatigable researches of De' Rossi, whilst preparing his great work on the Christian inscriptions of Rome, may be said to have now set this question at rest for ever. We are now able to say with certainty that there is no proof of the monogram ever having been used before the days of Constantine; and when this conclusion is received, we are startled to learn that on a hundred graves (more or less) in the Catacombs there has been found this symbol in conjunction with the *ampulla*. We ask ourselves whether it is probable that exceptional martyrdoms, *i. e.* martyrdoms during times of public peace, should have been so numerous, and yet no record of them be found in the pages of ecclesiastical history; our confidence is shaken in the significance of the vase; we can no longer accept it without doubt as a sure token of martyrdom.

But this is not all. Our knowledge of the Catacombs increases; thanks to the patience and skill of one who has devoted his whole life to their study, they are no longer a dark labyrinth, whose origin and history are lost in unknown antiquity: they assume the definite form of a subterranean city, of whose builders, indeed, history has not preserved to us many written records, yet whose chronology and geography may be learned with certainty from themselves; their walls and galleries and staircases and windows\* (so to speak) tell their own tale, publish their own dates, to those who have the skill to read them; and this tale, demonstrable itself, is inconsistent with the hitherto received opinion about the date of those graves which are marked with the *ampulla*; and if their date must be changed, their meaning must be changed too. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* Henceforward the *voxata questio* of the meaning of the vase must be abandoned; at least the vase cannot mean that the tenant of the grave where it is found was a martyr.

\* I allude, of course, to the *luminaria*.

Perhaps I can scarcely expect my readers to accept so grave a conclusion on the mere authority of an antiquarian, however eminent; but neither, on the other hand, can I anticipate his own publication of his very beautiful and interesting discoveries; but I will venture to tell a little anecdote, for the truth of which I can vouch, and which will suffice to show how far the conclusions of my friend may be trusted, even by those who have not the opportunity of examining his premisses. I forget the precise date of the rediscovery of the Catacomb of San Pretestato, or at least of the staircase which leads down to it, on the left-hand side of the Via Appia, nearly opposite the famous Catacomb of San Callisto. A gallery had been found leading out of the staircase about half way down, and the openings of a few other galleries at the foot of the staircase had been cleared of their rubbish; but as yet no inscriptions of any value had been recovered; none with a consular date, whereby to fix the chronology. De' Rossi had formed his own conjectures, or rather, I should say, had come to a very positive conclusion on this subject; but it was founded on analogy, and on a hundred signs and tokens which he had noticed, but which would have escaped any ordinary observer, and would not have been appreciated by him, even if he had seen them. One evening the corporal of the excavators, returning from his day's labour, and reporting progress to their master, said they had found an epitaph to-day, and it had the name of a consul on it, but only one; and that one was—Aurelius, let us say, or any other name that is of frequent occurrence in the Consular Fasti,—for I have forgotten the real name, and our corporal too had forgotten the *prænomen*; whether it was Titus, or Marcus, or Lucius, or what other, he couldn't say. "Where did you find it?" "At the bottom of the staircase." "Very well: I'll come out and see it to-morrow, and don't you touch it till I come." The corporal being dismissed, our antiquarian betook himself to his books and papers; and at the end of half an hour or more announced to a friend sitting in his room, "That consul must be such an one, and the inscription belongs to the year —; but it can't have been found at the bottom of the staircase. It must have come from that gallery which opens out of the staircase, on the right hand as you go down." The friend remonstrated at what seemed the absolute wildness of such conjectures; to trust his own deductions from books without having seen the stone, and, in one particular at least, *against* the testimony of those who had seen it! How could he possibly select the one Aurelius that was meant out of the five-and-twenty that *might* have been meant? and then his

verdict as to its position—it was monstrous! much learning had made him mad. “Come and see,” was the only rejoinder; and the invitation was gladly accepted. Early the following morning, the two friends stood at the bottom of the long steep staircase which dives into the Catacomb of St. Pretestato, and there at their feet lay the stone with the precious inscription. “Read it for yourself,” said the antiquarian, not condescending to stoop and see the verification of his own announcement. “The *prænomen* is Titus, isn’t it?” “Well, it is certainly; there’s no denying it. But, anyhow, you’re wrong as to its position; here it lies, just where we were told.” “Stop a minute, as to that. Corporal, where was that stone found?” “There, Signore, just where you’re standing.” “Did you find it yourself?” “No, Signore.” “Who did, then?” “Pasquale.” “Pasquale, where did you find that stone?” “Please, Signore, I dug it out of that gallery up there to the left, as you go up the stairs; but I and Valentino brought it down here out of the way, because we were afraid we should break it with our pickaxes.” The look of triumph in the antiquarian may be easily imagined; and in due course of time he vouchsafed to explain the process of reasoning by which he had been led to his conclusion. I will not trouble my readers with this, for I have already detained them too long; and my object is gained if I have succeeded in showing that somehow or other, it matters not how, learned men are able to distinguish with certainty between one portion of a Catacomb and another, and assign to each its true chronology. It only remains that I should add, that since this discovery has been made, it has been observed that graves with the *ampulla* never occur in the more ancient galleries, but abound especially in those corridors which are known to belong to the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth centuries; and having heard this fact, all candid and thoughtful inquirers must at once acknowledge that the controversy on this subject is at an end. Other objections that have been urged might be answered, or at least their force materially weakened, but from this there is no escape. It at once turns the scale finally and for ever against the supposition that the blood-stained vase is a sign of martyrdom; and hence (what “J. P.” means, I suppose, when he says that “new regulations have been made”) Rome has ceased for some years past to extract any *corpi santi* from the Catacombs, or to distribute those already extracted. Rome, with that cautious moderation and prudence which has always characterised her mode of action in matters of this kind, has silently and faithfully followed the progress of knowledge. So long as specious and



inconclusive objections only were urged against her practice, she disregarded them; when accurate and scientific knowledge could be brought to bear upon the matter, she listened and obeyed. The same authority which admitted the palm-branch two hundred years ago, and then by the mouth of Benedict XIV. rejected it, now refuses also to acknowledge that other token which the best and wisest of her children in former ages had always believed to be infallible—the vase of blood.

She still believes that the vases in question once contained the blood of martyrs, which, after having been carefully preserved, for many generations perhaps, in the families of those who had collected it, as a treasure and a defence against evil, was at length used for the consecration as it were of a grave in the Catacombs, and as a means of extending to the dead that blessing of protection of which it was piously believed to have been the frequent means or instrument to the living. It was, in fact, only another form of that practice which was common from the earliest ages, viz. of burying the dead as near as possible to the bodies of the saints. Every where in the Catacombs we see the most unequivocal proof of this desire; all proportion and symmetry is sacrificed, even paintings themselves are destroyed, in order to gratify Christian devotion in this matter. But there were necessarily limits to this practice; by and by every available portion of space must needs be occupied, and then, if they could not go near the saints, they would bring the relics of the saints near to them; and that which, as Prudentius has told us, was at first preserved at home as a *tutamen sacrum* was at length deposited at the tomb for a similar purpose. There is a curious letter, written in the year 1168, from the Dean and Chapter of some French Cathedral to the Archbishop of Cologne, in which they tell a story of the great St. Martin having begged for some of the relics of St. Maurice and the Theban legion; and when (not without a miracle) he had obtained some of their blood, it is added that he filled an *ampulla* with it, which he always carried about with him, and ordered that when he died, it should be put in his burial-place with him.\* Of course this testimony falls far short of the conclusion we desire to establish in point of antiquity; but I have given it the first place because of its identity in all other respects with the custom of which I am speaking. The testimony of Sozomen will carry us much further back; and he tells us a story† of a woman named Eusebia at Constantinople, infected indeed

\* Apud Surium ad Sept. 21, tom. v. p. 362, ed. Cologne, 1580.

† Hist. Eccles. lib. ix. c. 2.

with the Macedonian heresy, but having great devotion to the Forty Martyrs, of whom she had certain relics in her possession : when she was on her death-bed, she left her property to some religious, on condition that they should bury her there, *and bury with her these relics of the Forty Martyrs*. Other testimonies of the same age might be quoted, as well as proofs of another kind. And again, we have Charlemagne buried with a relic of the true cross, B. Maurus with a relic of St. Benedict, St. Bernard with a relic of St. Thaddæus, &c. &c. But as this is not the specific object of my present communication, I forbear. I will only say one word in conclusion to those who may be disposed to take amiss what we have had to say about the *ampulla* as a sign of martyrdom, and consequently about the veneration to some of the *corpi santi* extracted in times past from the Catacombs. Every Catholic knows how to distinguish between the Catholic dogma of the veneration due to relics, and the question of fact whether or not this particular relic be a true relic of a saint ; and they know also that the decision on this latter point is never pronounced as an article of the faith, but rests on human evidence, which varies in each individual case. The sanction of the Church creates of course a very strong presumption in favour of any relic that is proposed to our devotion ; and it does not require any extraordinary degree of humility to prefer her authority to our own individual judgment.

J. S. N.

[J. P. writes to us, that he has reason to believe that M. de' Rossi and V. D. B., the author of the book published at Brussels, though in perfect accord in the verdict that the matter in the *ampullas* is not the blood of the tenants of the tombs in or outside which they are found, are not agreed upon the question what that matter is. M. de' Rossi thinks it to be the blood of the martyrs of the third century, or of the Diocletian persecution ; V. D. B., on the other hand, considers that the matter is probably the sediment of consecrated wine, of the Eucharistical Blood, which was buried with the bodies of the faithful.

In the absence of any very ancient testimony to the usage of burying the blood of the martyrs, V. D. B.'s theory would seem more easily defensible, since it is well known, that the usage, or rather the abuse, of burying the Blessed Sacrament with the dead was very common in primitive times. It was prohibited by a canon of the third council of Carthage before the end of the fourth century. The same canon was repealed in other councils at the end of the sixth and of the seventh centuries. A portion of a consecrated Host was buried with St. Basil by his express desire. It is said that St. Benedict desired that all his monks should be buried with a portion of the Holy Eucharist laid upon their bodies, and that this

was the ordinary mode of burial among the Greek priests. A more doubtful instance is the burial of our own St. Cuthbert, as reported by St. Bede. But in all these instances it was under the species of bread, not wine, that the Holy Eucharist was buried with the dead. It is at least singular, if the practice was so common as the *ampullæ* of the Catacombs would show it to be, that no notice should, so far as we know, have come down to us of the burial of any but the species of bread.

It has also been suggested to us, that in each case a careful microscopical investigation of the deposit on the *ampulla* would suffice to show whether it is the remains of human blood or of wine. The crystals of bi-tartrate of potash in the deposit from wine would be nearly indestructible, and would be still perfectly recognisable after 2000 years. ED.]

### THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE.

THERE is a cynical saying of Halifax, which has been received with great applause by several generations of like-minded men, to the effect that, however it may be with regard to the next world, men's salvation in this world depends on their want of faith. A modern poet, who sometimes sings very sweetly, Mr. Gerald Massey, has protested eloquently against this chilling doctrine; he finds that none of the great deeds which have been wrought in the world have had want of faith for their motive power:

“‘They wrought in faith,’ and not ‘they wrought in doubt,’  
Is the proud epitaph inscribed above  
Our glorious dead. . . . .  
Because he did believe, Columbus sailed  
For that new world his inner eyes had seen;  
He found; so Faith its new worlds yet shall find,  
While Doubt shakes its wise head, and stays behind. . .  
Because we have believed our knowledge comes:  
Belief, not doubt, will touch the secret spring.”

There is no charter wider in its application, more evident in its results, and at the same time a more sore trial to this worldly faith of which I am speaking, than that which, without any exceptions, limitations, or glosses, annexes the promise of finding to all seeking: “every one that seeks finds.” Never has any liberal law excited a greater measure of fanatical obscurantism than this. With lawyer-like ingenuity, Tertullian was the first to cramp its freedom, and to fit it to the narrow gauge wherewith he thought to measure heaven and earth. It is a law, he says, which must needs be in-

terpreted by the rule of reason. What is the use of seeking, he asks, unless we know exactly what we are looking for, and unless we search for it at the right time, in the right place, and in the right manner? Here is a flood-gate opened for glosses and distinctions, till the commentary on the text almost assures us that it is of no use seeking; for no one that seeks finds unless he has already found, in which case further seeking would be of doubtful utility. I know that in the spiritual domain, even Tertullian's commentary has often a very true and necessary application; but it has been filtered into the world of secular thought, where it has less title to be, and has become embalmed in popular proverbs. The Spaniards say that no traveller brings home with him more than he carries abroad. And Dr. Johnson, I think, to whose torified mind such an opinion would have been very congenial, caps it with the saying that no one can observe properly without knowing beforehand what to see and how to see it. In modern language, that no tourist or excursionist can enjoy his trip unless he first studies his Murray's hand-book. Doubtless it is true for many minds. I have known students who declare that they never find in books aught but what they looked for; that when they wish to find texts on a fresh topic, they have to begin again, and read the book with a new direction of their intention to the point. Certainly, if we are to believe the candid Werenfels, this is the way in which Protestant divines have used the Bible:

“Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque  
Invenit, et pariter dogmata quisque sua.”

Men make their own opinions, and get them fixed in their minds, and then look for them in the Books of Nature and Revelation, where of course they find them. And unless they have these opinions ready provided, it is of no use to look, for no man can seek unless he knows what he is looking for. And it may be added, if they have them ready provided, it is equally useless to look, for it is folly to seek what a man already has.

Yet in the temporal, as in the spiritual, world, it must be allowed that there is more than one kind of research. There is the search for what, though well known in itself, cannot at present be found—as when an old lady has mislaid her keys, or when a young cockney seeks the pea beneath the thimbles. But there is also the search for that which is at present undiscovered; and this is the great seeking which fires the fancy, inspires the will, and adds the final completion to the mind. Many will always be contented with a lower

kind of seeking ; will think it enough to find what they are told to look for, and to look for it in the way they are ordered. They will find that persons have been kind enough to explore all roads for them, and to draw up a hand-book for every region. The traveller has only to take his Murray's hand-book, the meteorologist his Admiralty manual ; he will be told what to observe at each step of his progress, and at each hour of the day. If he still feels his freedom fresh about him while he is cooped up with these fetters, and aspires to nothing beyond ; if he does not consider it simply as a necessary education in accuracy, but thinks it the highest point to which he is called,—then it is abundantly clear that he will never advance beyond his teachers, never know more than Murray or the manual can tell him.

The science of physical research was not reduced to rules in the middle ages ; if any rule at all had been laid down, I doubt not that it would have been something like Tertullian's rule for spiritual seeking ; and discovery would have been, in name at least, reduced to a stock of recipes for making the Elixir of Life, or the Philosopher's Stone, as precise as Mrs. Glasse's directions for roasting pigs or boiling potatoes. But whatever the theory was, the practice was something widely different. In fact, the objects of search were so mysterious and unknown, that any precise mode of searching, however desirable it might be supposed to be, would have been impossible. The alchemists and wizards could not have had a very clear idea of the nature of the elixir or the stone which they spent their lives in seeking. The *lapis philosophicus* was

“ a stone,  
And not a stone ; a spirit, a soul, and a body :  
Which if you do dissolve, it is dissolved ;  
If you coagulate, it is coagulated ;  
If you make it to fly, it flieth.”

And its virtue was such, that one part projected on a hundred or a thousand parts of any metal would turn them into the purest gold. While the elixir, the “ flower of the sun,” would

“ confer honour, love, respect, long life ;  
Give safety, valour, yea and victory. . . .  
Cure all diseases coming of all causes—  
A month's grief in a day, a year's in twelve.”

This was the object of search ; and the place where, and the manner how, it was to be sought are equally sublime. Roger Bacon tells us there were seven methods of procuring it, all of which agreed in requiring that the stone “ should be projected into the sky, and again plunged into the abyss ; and this

process was to be repeated till the son became father, and father son, and till body became spirit."

No one can complain of being cramped by too minute and particularised rules in this search ; it is as free as the winds and waves ; the method, in its fine frenzy rolling, wanders from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven, and back again into the abyss. You know neither what you are looking for, nor where to look for it. And yet, did the search lead to nothing ? On the contrary, alchemy was the cradle of chemistry ; the elixir was the seed of pharmacy ; astrology was the vestibule of astronomy ; and the dreams of mediæval magicians and story-tellers were the germs of the great inventions of our day. Friar Bacon, who recognises one of the most mighty of all natural forces in the modification which the human voice impresses on the air, and through the air on the wood, or iron, or body or soul on which the speaker wishes to operate,—Friar Bacon, who thus was as great a wizard as Michael Scott, and fully as capable of nursing the secret of "the words that cleft Eildon Hills in three" as an unutterable mystery, promises his disciples that they shall do greater works than any which magic can effect,—that they shall make "ships without oars that shall go faster with only one steersman to manage than if they were full of sailors,—carriages drawn by no beast that shall move with inconceivable speed (as, he says, the ancient scythed-chariots are supposed to have been),—flying machines, with a man in the middle to flap the wings,—little instruments a few inches square that will raise indefinite weights, by which a man may escape out of prison, or drag a thousand struggling men,—also instruments for walking on the water, or for diving to the bottom. For Alexander the Great used such instruments, and whatever has been may be again." These anticipations, which Bacon founds on history, but upon history which had no foundation but a fancy as wild as that which invented the story of Sinbad the Sailor, seem like prophecies when read by the light of modern discoveries. Would Friar Bacon have been able to make them, think you, if he had confined himself to the strict rules of investigation, if he had been obliged to define the object and the method of his search before he began it ? No ; ignorance must be allowed to dream, or it will never come to know.

I go in, therefore, for the loosest and most liberal interpretation of our great charter—every one that seeks finds. Not that he always finds what he seeks, or his finding would often be of very little use to him ; not that he is never disappointed, for that would be contrary to the rule of our

existence : there are more blanks than prizes in all lotteries, and most blanks in the lottery of life. It is often the case that we shoot and hit nothing ; sometimes we shoot at a pigeon and kill a crow, and now and then we are lucky enough to shoot at a crow and hit a pigeon,—as Saul went out for his father's asses, and found a throne. But this varied success of our search does not depend upon the rules by which we search, but upon luck. All methods of search are successful in their turn ; there is no infallible rule for discovery. *Tous les chemins mènent à Rome.* The Malays have a theory that the ocean is an infinite plain of water studded at intervals with islands ; therefore, if they start in any given direction, and advance long enough in the same line, they are sure to find land at last ; thus they have colonised the islands of the Pacific. Would they have done so if they had never started till they knew whither they were bound ? Doubtless there were plenty of starved crews of emigrants which never came to land : but history records nothing about them, and I will not trouble myself with their fate ; they only hastened by a few years their appointed end. They found something, if it was not what they sought. I do not deny that he who gropes in the dark often lights upon that he would not. Neither do I deny that there are foolish ways of seeking, which we cannot expect to be rewarded. It would be a blind search to look for a goose in the oil-pot, fat hogs in Jewry, or wine in a fishing-net ; but you might find oil in the can, fish in the net, and fleas in Jewry. There are plenty of chances every where ; many things grow in all gardens that were never sown there ; and if the good dog sometimes goes dinnerless, in the mouth of the bad dog there not seldom falls a good bone.

The fatal objection to all philosophies of discovery is, that they fetter the free fancy, they discourage the ideal, and only allow a man to seek that which he has beforehand. They tend to improve the manner of our possession, but they do not increase its extent. They lead to accuracy, to fresh applications, to ease in manufacture, to plentiful supply ; but they destroy the artistic, the ideal, the free scope of the fancy and of the intellect. And gradually and surely, when this is destroyed, the other arts become almost useless. As a jewel of gold in a swine's snout, so are the triumphs of European genius and fancy in the hands of the Chinaman : he may be a handy worker, he may be a successful producer, and an eager trader ; but he is perfectly contented with what he has, he has no ideal object in view, and therefore his nation, though it numbers one-fourth of the human race, is without

influence in the world, and has sunk down into the most dismal intellectual condition. So again, compare the Arabs, as they exist now in Algeria and Morocco, splendid men to look at, dignified, grave, and majestic; great gentlemen, satisfied that their race and religion are the flower of the world, and that all others are but chaff in comparison; hating labour, not only as pain, but as a degradation; living by impulse, and satisfying their present wants with a lordly indifference to consequences, either to themselves or others; but squalid, false, and cruel, not only incapable of mounting the stairs of civilisation, but refusing to be helped up;—compare these men, who have no ideal before them but to wait upon fate, and to expect the “Lord of the hour” to come and deliver them, with their ancestors the first sons of the Prophet,—fevered fanatics, who propagated their faith with the cimeter, reigned in Spain, invaded France, devastated Italy, and erected the Alhambra; founded the Spanish schools; and taught Aristotle’s philosophy, Ptolemy’s astronomy, and Euclid’s geometry, to the European races. For then the Arabs had an ideal before them; and though this ideal was only that of a universal empire, in such grand dreams the sword does not count for all, the claims of mind and thought are not altogether unattended to. Mrs. S. C. Hall has a pleasant tale wherein an old Irishman is represented “watching for the time” in perfect indolence and placid expectancy. In Sam Slick’s Sketches there is a similar loiterer, who is contrasted forcibly with the go-ahead dash of the Clockmaker, who by his own energy of character rescues the idler from his fatal lethargy. These dreamers perhaps had an ideal, but it was rather the ideal of the romance-reader, who waits for the knight who is to come and purloin her, without moving hand or foot to hasten his coming, than the ideal of the romance-writer, whose dream of the loves of the heroes is capped by a more golden vision of profit and fame. We may be passive dreamers, or active. The passive dream leaves nothing but an impression; the active dream leaves a resolve behind, and thus becomes a prophecy which fulfils itself. If men would honestly tell us their dreams, I dare say that we might restore the lost art of onciromancy, and guess shrewdly enough what the dreamer would attempt to do. Your dry philosopher is apt to overlook the scientific importance of the mystical element in our nature which gives birth to these dreams. But without it I doubt whether science would ever have been born. We have seen how the anticipations of Roger Bacon were founded on his conceptions of history, and how this history was founded on nothing but the romantic



fancy of the story-tellers. Here at least the paternity of science is not doubtful. And in general I think it likely that the pursuit of the ideal is mixed up with a reminiscence, traditional or fanciful, of the primitive state of man, and with a conception of the great plan and object of human life that begins with paradise and ends with the millennium. Any thing that we think has been, we must think may be again, and the best historians may be the truest prophets. In this sense, we may accept the saying of Halifax, that the first requisite for the prophet is a good memory,—not merely the selfish memory that will keep him consistent amidst contradictions, but the great secular memory which is a storehouse of the changes of the world. “Knowledge,” said Plato, “is but an awakening of memories.” A dream that is altogether new does not even solicit the practical faculties to attempt to realise it; a dream that is accompanied by the conviction that it once has been realised may easily drive the dreamer to attempt to realise it again. And for this reason, I much doubt whether the true men of progress are not those who, like Burke, are perpetually recurring to the wisdom of our ancestors, rather than those who, like Bright, coldly depreciate all ages in comparison of that in which they live. The present is the commonplace; the future is a void; in the past all ideals find their true home; and he who has not an object of admiration in the past is scarcely likely to have an ideal object of pursuit for the future, except perhaps some object moulded on the present and embodying all its vulgarity and materialism. For unless the ideal is composed out of the elements of the past, it can have no grandeur about it.

The pursuit of the ideal has been as remarkable in politics as in science, and though the political ideal has never been realised like the scientific ideal, the pursuit of it has determined the course of history. The Papal system of states as conceived by the great mediæval Popes, which is now being traced in the pages of this Review, is an instance. The modern European ideal of the balance of power is another case in point;—never perfectly realised, always advancing society a step on its appointed path. In like manner, all the attempts at universal empire,—the Persian invasions of Europe, the Eastern expedition of Alexander, the great empire of the Romans, the struggles of the German Emperors, the accomplished purposes, and far more the dreams, of Napoleon,—were all intended to reach an ideal, and all broke down, but have carried the germs of ideas and institutions into the places where they were wanted for God’s design, as birds carry the

seeds of plants across continents and seas, then drop them where they become the fathers of new forests.

In like manner, different political principles or habits have been at different times proclaimed to be the universal remedy for all public evils. At one time it is liberty, at another nationality, then equality, then brotherhood, then socialism. Not one of these ideas ever was, or ever can be, wholly realised ; but they can perform a part in the world. Plato's Republic was impossible, so was More's Utopia, so is the Icarie of the French socialists ; but men who set these ideals before them as a rule of conduct can impress the age, can divert the current of thought and of action, and can give a character to a century.

The pursuit of the geographical ideal has left still clearer footsteps on the map. It has at one time driven men north to seek the amenities of the hyperborean regions ; Cathay and El-dorado have drawn men with as strong a physical attraction as the suspended thistle draws the donkey. The Spaniards thronged to America for its gold and silver, and bestowed on its inhabitants all the Catholic civilisation that they have got. The ideal has been to nations like the star which the Magi followed. The star of the Germanic nations first led them northward, and then took them south, till they had found and seized their allotted place ; for all great nations have conquered their homes.

But here comes a difficulty. There is a perpetual inequality between the real and the ideal ; the ideal is never realised. When, therefore, shall a man cease his pilgrimage ? when shall he say, this is a sufficient fulfilment of my wishes, this is enough to content me ? When is a man to accept, and when is he to refuse, the proffered instalment of his hopes ? He who will never accept the real because it is still too far from the ideal, condemns himself to everlasting labour and perpetual failure, and is only paving the road of despair. It is sometimes the clearest evidence of strength of mind to take what you can get, however inadequate it may seem. The sailor does not abandon his ship because he cannot command the winds, nor does he change his destination because the winds are not favourable ; he makes the best of what is actually given him. The preacher does not consign all his flock to Satan because they are not converted by his first sermon. The politician, when he finds that he cannot make things go well, tries to make them go as little ill as possible. He knows that

“ all success

Proves partial failure ; all advance implies

What's left behind ; all triumph, something crushed  
At the chariot-wheels ; all government, some wrong."

But, on the other side, to be ready to accept the first offer, to rest from your pilgrimage, and to build your house on the first oasis you find, is to have too weak a hold of the ideal. About nineteen centuries ago, it is said, there was a tradition in China, that a great prince, the lord of the coming age, was born in the West ; ambassadors were sent, who met the first Buddhist missionaries on their way to China. The ambassadors were satisfied ; India was west enough for them ; Fo was prince enough to satisfy their ideal ; and they returned to curse their country with the religion of annihilation and of dreams. About the same time other wise men set out from another region of the dreamy East, and followed a star which led them to Bethlehem ; they also sought a Prince surrounded with the pomp of royalty, and they found and recognised their Ideal under the rags of the meanest poverty. So is it ever in the search for the ideal ; there are some who seem to succeed at once, but their fortune is the grossest failure ; there are others who go farther and appear to fare worse, and are obliged at last to put up with a mere apology for that which their high hopes had promised them—but they have succeeded. Those who set out from the land of dreams, and follow the star which seems to promise them a splendid empire in the land of realities, must both hope too high to be led aside by the first phantom that invites them, and must also mix with their hopes the humility which will neither refuse to recognise the monarch without his robes, nor be scandalised at apparent poverty and weakness where they expected riches and strength, if only the germ of what they sought lies hidden within.

Without an ideal to pursue, men will never labour long and heartily ; with too great an attachment to their own ideal, they will never effect any thing, for they will always despise the practicable in their aspirations for the impossible. They must aim at the impossible in order to hit the possible, but they must be quick to recognise the possible when it comes into view. He who wishes to excite a people to action must always promise more than he has to give. It is not only the French who fight for an idea ; any nation would refuse to contend for the merely practicable, with all its costliness and all its drawbacks, if it could be displayed beforehand. No people would consent to carry on a war of scepticism ; there must be enthusiasm, the imagination must be excited, there must be an idea. The Emperor must promise to drive the Austrians over the Alps, or into the Adriatic, if

he wishes to raise a power strong enough to drive them behind the Mincio. The Liberator must go in for repeal, when he would be overjoyed at a far different measure of "justice." So now the leaders in Ireland must agitate for the total suppression of the national system, though perhaps they know that they may after all have to content themselves with its reform, with the correction of its abuses, and with what improvements they can extort.

The people, therefore, must always be gulled; they will not act except upon impulse: the popular ballad says, "in the folly lies the pleasure; wisdom always makes it less." It is wise to moderate our expectations, and to be ready for disappointment; but it is not the way to move the masses. Even if they can be moved for a moderate measure, it is almost lost labour to move them; their very success disbands them again. When we hope high, every success, however great, is but a partial accomplishment of our aspirations. There still remains a goodly measure of unfulfilled hope. If we pitch our hopes low, success leaves us hopeless; we have no farther object in life but to relapse into the sleepy state of the Chinaman. Human activity is a more desirable end than any material result of that activity. The child takes salt to put on the bird's tail; he catches no birds, but he gets what is much better, health and strength and rosy cheeks, and so falsifies Pope's maxim, that "none can compass more than they intend." The pursuit of any object is usually felt to be so good in itself that men are disappointed with too rapid a success:

*"Nolo quod cupio statim tenere,  
Nec victoria mi placet parata."*

It is good, then, to propose an ideal, if only with the object of rousing people to activity, even though we have no real hopes of attaining what we propose.

But in thus raising expectations and getting up a cry, several risks are run; there is always danger in humbugging our fellow-creatures; and though we were too sure of our friends to fear their turning against us for disappointing them, yet there are always enemies to be feared. If there was but one party, one set of interests in the world, the only object of leaders would be to get this party to work; any cry, any idea, that would suffice to rouse them would fulfil its destiny. But when there are two parties, two conflicting interests, the cry that will excite one is always sure to react upon the other. It should, then, be a question for the leaders whether the action which they invite, or the reaction which they provoke, is likely to be the strongest and most lasting. The man com-

mits an unpardonable blunder who collects a mob, inflames it with hot speeches, exalts it upon tall words, buckrams it with loud resolutions, and sends it home to do nothing; and at the same time provokes the jealousy of an active and hostile band to take effectual measures to retain the unfair advantages against which his agitation was commenced. It would be a very ill result of an enthusiastic meeting at St. James's Hall if it only established a hostile committee at Exeter Hall to thwart all its resolutions.

The pursuit of the ideal is no easy matter; to follow a phantom with the hope of attaining it,—for if we hope not, we shall not stir a foot,—and yet to be conscious that it is a phantom; to keep before the mind its shadowy, vaporous consistence in such a way as to be ready to turn aside from it to secure any solid advantages that present themselves on the way, and yet to have enough faith in its solidity and reality to make us beware how we stop and pick up the golden apples that are dropped on our path to allure us aside; to remember who mistook the shadow for the meat in the fable, and yet not to sell our reversion to the splendid shadow at too low a price,—all this requires prudence and judgment as well as strength of imagination—a combination rare at all times, rarest perhaps now.

---

#### A TRUE REPORT OF THE LIFE AND MARTYRDOM OF MR. RICHARD WHITE, SCHOOLMASTER.\*

I HAVE received your letters (my dear friends) dated the 17th day of November, wherein you renew your old suit unto me to lay down in a brief discourse the lingering martyrdom of Mr. Richard White, the which had been done before this day, had I not hoped that some other man of greater skill and experience would take in hand so good a matter, answerable to the weight and worthiness thereof; but understanding that those who are better able than myself to do it are either employed to other business of greater importance that they can have no leisure, or else hindered by the iniquity of the time that they can have no opportunity, I have presumed here, as it were with a coal,

\* The following is printed from a contemporary Ms. that was found some time ago in the Mission House of the Catholic Chapel, Holywell. It agrees in the main with the long account of the death of the "Protomartyr of Wales" given by Dr. Bridgewater (from which Dr. Challoner drew up his brief memoir), but is an independent production, entering into many more details than are given in the published account.

rudely to draw the portraiture of his great patience and constancy, rather than that the memory of so glorious a martyr should perish, referring the polishing and painting thereof in colours to a more cunning workman.

Therefore you shall understand that he was born at Llandydlos in Montgomeryshire, and descended of honest parentage, bearing the surname of Gwin; but after his coming to the University, some of his acquaintance, perceiving the Welsh word to signify *White* in English, termed him *White*, by the which name he was ever afterward known and called. Of his younger years there is nothing memorable, saving that he was twenty years of age before he did frame his mind to like of good letters; at which years, following the counsel of the wise philosopher (who saith), *quod nunquam sera est ad bonos mores via*, he gave his mind to repair to such places as he knew most famous for learning.

Imitating  
herein the  
example of  
Plato.

First he travelled to Oxford, where he made no great abode; from thence he resorted to Cambridge, and there made choice of St. John's College, where he lived by the charity of the said College, and chiefly of Dr. Bullock, then head of the household, his very good benefactor. But when alteration of religion compelled sundry principal men of both Universities to leave their rooms and livings, the said Dr. Bullock, amongst the rest, left also his house and country. Afterwards, a new governor being placed in his stead. "who knew not Joseph," need and poverty compelled this young man to become a teacher before he could perfectly lay the foundation to be a learner; and when he had bestowed some few years in the University, God put in his mind, by persuasion of friends, to return towards his own country; and so he placed himself in Maelor, where he bestowed his poor talent among the youths of that country, and in the end his life and blood for their further benefit. A happy return to the whole country, if the miserable blind people would consider of it; much they are beholden unto him for the offices of his life, but much more for his glorious death and martyrdom.

Exod. i. 8.

Bromefield  
in Den-  
bighshire.

The whole time he remained there was about sixteen years, the which he so divided that all Maelor and every part thereof might fare the better by him. First, he placed himself in Orton Madock, where he spent most of these years; from thence he removed to Wrexham (where he spent his life as you shall understand hereafter), and so he went to Gresford, then to Yswyd, and last of all to Orton again; by reason of which public charge in all these places he was greatly

acquainted, his company of the better sort much desired, and of the people generally loved for his diligence in teaching and other good parts known to be in him. His moderation and temperance in his life and conversation were such, that his adversaries could never to this day charge him with any notable crime, or any other fault than the following of his faith and conscience (which nowadays is accounted madness), for testimony whereof I appeal to those places where he hath conversed. During this while he so profited by his own private study in knowledge of good literature, that it was wonder to them that knew him before to see in the man so great ripeness from so late a beginning. He was not unskilful in most of the liberal sciences, and in histories very well seen; but now in his latter time he gave his time wholly to the study of divinity: as for his knowledge in the Welsh tongue, he was inferior to none in his country, whereto he hath left to posterity some precedent in writing, eternal monuments of his wit, zeal, virtue, and learning. A little before his coming to Orton this latter time, he married thence a young girl, by whom he had six children, whereof he sent three to heaven before him in their infancy; the other three he left with their mother. And so being the second time placed in Orton among his wife's friends, Mr. Downam, the named bishop of Chester, and his officers began to molest him for refusing to receive at their communion-table. In the end, after some troubles, he yielded to their desires, although greatly against his stomach, by the earnest persuasion of a gentleman, who had him then, and hath now a great part of that country at command; and lo, by the providence of God, he was no sooner come out of the church but a fearful company of crows and kites so persecuted him to his home that they put him in great fear of his life, the conceit whereof made him also sick in body as he was already in soul diseased; in the which sickness he resolved himself (if God would spare him life) to become a Catholic, the which good purpose, afterward having recovered his health, he performed accordingly.

But the enemy of mankind, envying his well-doing, and fearing lest the example of so good a man, being a public person, would do much harm to his cause, incited the minds of such as were (in the parish) before infected with heresy to molest him, who never gave over their malice until they had banished him out of the country and diocese. From thence he went over the river of Dee unto Erbistock, where, in an old barn, he exercised still his former profession of teaching; but the spiteful heretics,

Roger  
Puleston.

He is pre-  
sented.

made means to expel him thence also, and to despatch him at length out of the whole country; for, indeed, they were unworthy to have among them so blessed a man.

Then he travelled abroad to seek relief and comfort among strangers which was denied him by his own countrymen at home, who were most beholden unto him. In the end it pleased God to deliver him to the hands of his adversaries, in that town where he afterwards suffered.

His first apprehension in Wrexham. The next day after his apprehension being Thursday, the justices of the peace met in the said town to determine of him; in the mean time the prisoner escaped, for that Thursday was not yet come wherein, in the same place, he should glorify God by his constant death.

His second apprehension in July 1580. And before two years were expired he was apprehended again by one David Edwards, a mercer, not far from the place whence he had made

his escape, who laid violent hands on him in the highway, having neither commission from superior magistrates nor any special quarrel with the party himself, but of a foolish blind zeal, being a hot Puritan, and of spiteful hatred to the man's religion. Now the servant of God having the second time fallen into the hands of his enemies, was first carried to the mercer's house (who took him), and both

Siambar  
ddu.

This gentleman was a continual enemy to the prisoner, and busy at his indictment, but never lived to see his death, ending his own life miserably.

His usago  
at  
Ruthin.

John Salusbury of  
Rug.

his legs were loaded with heavy bolts. Afterward conveyed to the black chamber, a vile and filthy prison, where he lay on the cold ground two days and two nights; fed, &c.; thence brought before Robert Puleston to be examined, who (being an enemy to the Catholic religion) returned his commitment for vehement suspicion of treason; so he was sent to Ruthin (for there the gaol remained), both arms being made sure with strong handbolts, where, at his first coming, the gaoler entertained him with a huge pair of bolts on both heels, the which continued the first quarter. Marry, towards the second quarter, the gaoler being now better acquainted with the man's behaviour and innocency, remitted some part of his former rigour towards him. And here I may not omit to tell you a strange accident which chanced to a gentleman of good account in the country a little after the prisoner's coming to town, who, passing by the gaol in company with one Goodman, Dean of Westminster, and perceiving the prisoner to stand in the door, first paused a while beholding him, then shook his head upon him, saying, "Oh, White, White, thou art an unprofitable member of the com-



monwealth!" the which words he spake in hearing of this preacher, to maintain a little credit he was in with him and other heretics, but plainly against his own conscience and knowledge; for all the country knew him to be inclined in mind unto the same religion for the which the other man sustained imprisonment and irons even in his presence. But see what followed: the gentleman returned home sick, and was never seen abroad after this word until he came to be buried; a sore word to the man himself, and a good example to all dissemblers, especially in credit and authority, to take heed what they say or do against their own conscience. Another chance happened, no less strange than the former, unto a preacher, one Ithel Thelwell, son to Simon Thelwell (who afterward, as you shall hear, pronounced sentence of death upon the martyr). This minister, being Master of Arts and a preacher of no small account, having entered unto his sermon (before the judges and all the worship of the shire, in the assize week, which he had no doubt provided against the Catholic religion and this holy confessor), suddenly fell dumb, that the judges themselves were fain to call him out of the pulpit with shame enough; whereupon there wanted not some who affirmed that Mr. White had bewitched him; but many reported that this good man's imprisonment was the cause of the preacher's dumbness. But what think you? were the magistrates moved with the sight hereof to take compassion on their prisoner? Nothing less: "Induratum enim erat cor Pharaonis ne dimitteret Israel,"—Israel should not depart.

A preacher struck dumb.

Exod. x.

In this first assize, kept at Ruthin about Michaelmas A.D. 1580, he had not much said to him, saving that the judges were earnestly in hand with him to accuse his benefactors and forsake his religion, wherein God so assisted him that they could not prevail. Towards Christmas, the gaol was removed unto Wrexham, where a new gaoler received him with a great pair of shackles, the which he was compelled to wear both day and night all the year following, by the special commandment of the sheriff, an enemy to all good men, and namely to this man of God, even to his last breath and after.

The first assize kept at Ruthin.

Owen Brereton.

Now the second assize being kept at Wrexham, in May A.D. 1581, the adversaries were busy to make him relent, so far at the least as to hear an heretical sermon, for they did imagine that his fall would give the Catholic religion a sore blow, especially in Maelor, where the people depended much upon his virtue and learn-

The second assize at Wrexham.

ing. But when the magistrates saw that fair means and gentle persuasions could take no place, they began to extend towards him plain violence; for presently six of the sheriff's men were commanded to carry him unto the church, who took the servant of God upon their shoulders, with his heels upward, and so bare him in procession-wise round about the font (a very strange spectacle to the beholders), laying him along under the pulpit, where a preacher was ready to welcome the poor man with a railing sermon. But all this while he so stirred his legs that with the noise of his irons the preacher's voice could not be heard; whereat

He is carried to the church upon men's shoulders.

Thomas Jones.

the judges and sheriff were in a great rage, commanding to carry him thence into the stocks; but he told them that it needed not, for he offered to go with them quietly to any punishment for his conscience, yea to the gallows, if they would have it; but to their schismatical assemblies, he told them, he would never go or come quietly. And thus he was locked in the stocks, by both legs, from ten o'clock before noon until eight at night, vexed all the time with a rabble of ministers.

In the end he was turned loose toward his gaol, halting all the way as he went by reason of stiffness in his legs overcharged with stocks and fetters, which rueful spectacle the mercer beholding brake forth into a great laughter; a lewd nature of a malicious heretic, to feed himself in such wicked malice upon the cruel affliction of the poor man. In the mean time the magistrates, consulting how they might collect matter enough out of that day's work to make him away, caused a jury to be empannelled, men for their own purpose, haters of the Catholic faith, to whom was no store made of his demeanour in the church, and words to the justices. But the jury perceiving that the evidence against him did not bear weight, found the bill for a disturbance of divine service; and thereupon he

The lewd nature of an heretic.

He is indicted in a hundred marks.

The statute against disturbers of divine service.

was fined by Judge Bromley in a hundred marks; a most wicked verdict and sentence against all law of God and man; and a pretty stratagem, first to do open violence to his body, and then to bring him under the danger of their law; I dare say contrary to the intention of the law-makers themselves, who could not conceive a man in his case violently carried to their church upon men's shoulders. Well, howsoever they conceive, I am sure that many who were present at this device complained of the injustice done unto him that day, the which even God Himself,

to the honour of His servant, showed presently before the bar, by an evident miracle; for when James Garm, the pronotary, or primity, should have read the bill of his indictment, he was stricken blind, as we read of Elymas the sorcerer to have been by the sentence of St. Paul; and whereas the judge called upon him twice or thrice to read the bill, the said pronotary, opening his breast in a great rage, confirmed with an oath that he was stark blind; whereunto Sir George replied, "Speak softly, lest the Papists make a miracle of that." And thus the bill was turned over to be read by another clerk that stood by.

The pronotary is stricken blind.

Acts xiii.

Obstinacy with great blindness and partiality in a judge.

The assize being kept at Denbigh in September following, there was no great matter done against him, saving that Sir George Bromley caused him to be indicted in seven score pounds for not coming to church, upon the penal statute of twenty pounds a month, then lately enacted; a ridiculous thing that a poor man lying close prisoner many years together, and at the command of his gaoler, should notwithstanding be guilty of the statute before it was devised. But equity and conscience can have no place where corrupt and blind affection reigneth. After that he was fined in this double mulct,—viz. at the assizes before in a hundred marks for coming to church, and at this assize in two hundred marks for not coming,—it pleased Mr. Justice to play and sport with his prisoner (as the cat doth with the mouse before she devour it), pleasantly demanding of him what he had to discharge himself of his debt; whereunto Mr. White, very devoutly making low obeisance, answered, "I have somewhat towards it." "What hast thou?" sayeth the justice. "I have," sayeth he, "sixpence;" the which answer did set Sir George in such a rage that nothing might cool the same until he beheld the poor man's legs well charged with two pair of irons, for fear belike of running away, now being so much in the queen's debt. Some which were present at this talk reproved the prisoner for crossing Mr. Justice, being he knew well that the man could never abide to be crossed; some were of a contrary mind, allowing his answer as proceeding from the wise man's counsel, who biddeth answer a fool according to his foolishness, that he may not seem wise in his own conceit. To tell you mine opinion, I think that the demand was beside all wit and discretion to ask a poor prisoner, who depended on the devotion and charity of others, what he had to discharge 300 marks and odd money.

The third assize kept at Denbigh.

A wise question.

This confessor's jesting proceeded from a sincere and quiet conscience.

He weareth double irons.

At this assize John Hughes and Robert Moris, his fellows, were first committed to prison with him, who had long before his apprehension sustained irons for the same cause at the council in the Marches, and were now removed to their own country, no doubt by the special providence of God, to receive mutual comfort one of the other, and especially to learn of this blessed confessor the rules of perfect charity, patience, devotion, and all other acts of virtue.

The next assize, kept at Wrexham in the year 1582, the adversaries having learned the experience in the same place a twelvemonth before, that forced haling of the prisoner to sermons could take no good end, devised another stratagem more cunning than the former, but with as ill success: for upon Friday in the assize week, at about four of the clock in the afternoon, the prisoners were sent for to the bar, where, beside their expectation, a minister was ready to entertain them with an heretical sermon, of the which wrong they ceased not to complain to the judges, telling them that they came not thither to hear sermons, but to receive law and justice. Marry, their complaint taking no place, they turned their speech to the preacher, the one in Latin, the other in English, and the third in Welsh, so fast that the magistrates were not a little offended with them, threatening them, if they would not give over, heavy bolts, whips, stocks, dungeons, and pillory; to be short, the prisoners were removed in no small displeasure, and the preacher made an end of his lying sermon with small grace.

In this assize certain pedlars and tinkers, who then bare some sway in the town, hot Puritans and full of the gospel, complained upon the sheriff that he was not so sharp to his prisoners as they required, yea, moreover, in plain terms, that he relieved them; an heinous offence (if it were true), and worthy punishment, that a magistrate should give such an open example as to do a deed of charity,—if it be a deed of charity to relieve poor Papists; for, except I mistake, the Protestant preachers have found out of late in their new divinity that Christian men are bound to relieve felons and murderers in prison, or any other malefactor, but not Papists; and this Christopher Goodman teacheth and practiseth at West Chester, where he taketh special order that the poor Catholics in the castle may reap no benefit by the poor man's box and other relief which is in the city gathered for prisoners; whereby may appear that all is not the word of the Lord (whereof these fellows brag so

The fourth  
assize kept  
at Wrex-  
ham.

At Easter  
none was  
admitted  
to the com-  
munion-  
table but  
such as had  
a token  
from one of  
the two  
tinkers.

much) that cometh out of their mouths, but they are glad now and then to drop among it some of their own words and inventions: and this by the way; now to the matter:

Upon this complaint presently order was laid down by the judges that Mr. Sheriff must have four overseers to assist him, who so narrowly looked to their charges that all access of their friends unto them was barred, except of their wives only; and they were not suffered to bring them any relief at all but these honest men must oversee it; the which strange dealing did drive into the people's heads such a mutiny, that every man affirmed how their adversaries did mean to despatch the poor man by famine whom they could not make away by any colour of law. And here I may not forget to tell you the notable malice that David Edwards, the mercer before named, one of the said overseers, bare this man of God; who, being on horseback ready to take his journey, and beholding the prisoner to stand at the gaol-door in his irons, with his little child in his arms, suddenly the spiteful wretch, as one in some frantic mood, crossed the way towards him, and in a great rage overthrew him backwards on the stones, leaving the print of his nails in his face, putting also the babe in no small hazard of his life. But what think you? durst he complain hereof to the judges? Or could he hope to find any remedy at their hands? Nothing less. The good man laid up this injury among others more, to be remedied by a more indifferent Judge, who would no doubt one day, and could, remedy the same. Another like token of a malicious heart this desperate heretic showed about the same time, causing his wife and daughter to depose before Jevan Lloyd of Yale that the prisoner was seen two flight-shots from the gaol (naming the place); the which his gaoler disproved to their faces, affirming that one Jevan Lewis was the man, and not he. Where you may see what malice can do in a wicked mind, void of God's fear, conscience, religion, and all goodness. Verily, if justice might have taken place; the pillory, which was a little before threatened (as you have heard) to the innocent man and his fellows, should have been the reward of these perjured women, for whom and for such it was chiefly ordained.

The Michaelmas following our prisoners were removed to the Holt (where the assize was kept),

Tinkers  
aggravate  
matters  
against the  
prisoners.  
The sheriff  
was one Mr.  
Edward  
Hughes, of  
the Holt.  
Four over-  
seers,  
whereof  
Vicar Sonl-  
ley and  
David Ed-  
wards were  
two.

The cruelty  
of an  
heretic.  
Oh, cursed  
cattiff!  
more inhu-  
man than  
Turk or  
heathen.

Jury of two  
women.

Coytmor.

Well may  
these evan-  
gelical  
brethren  
brag of  
their only  
faith; for  
they have  
not one  
dram of  
charity  
among  
them.

to be there indicted of high treason, as appeareth by a letter  
 that Mr. White wrote himself to a friend of his,  
 The fifth assize kept at Holt. the copy whereof I have laid down *verbatim* as followeth :

*The Copy of Mr. White his Letter, reporting the indictment of the three prisoners at the Holt, and the manner of their adversaries' proceeding against them.*

"After my hearty commendations, these are to certify you of our estate. Upon Friday in the assize week we were indicted of high treason by the great inquest, Owen Brereton being foreman, by the procurement of David Edwards, Sir Hugh Sonlley the apostata, David Powell Goch, Vicar of Ruabon, who did follow the bill against us (as far as I could understand); for Mr. Justice Townsend demanding who followed the bill, the clerk of the indictment gave answer, David Powell, and he then stood at the bar. Sir Hugh Sonlley and David Edwards had gotten one Lewis Gronow, of Miriadock in this county of Denbigh (who was prisoner with us for an execution debt), to bear witness against us, the which Lewis had been on the pillory at Denbigh by the procurement of Mr. Tudur Probert. This honest man, being examined before the two judges, Jevan Lloyd of Yale, Roger Puleston, Owen Brereton, and others, deposed that we three had persuaded him and divers others to abstain from the church, and to acknowledge the Pope's authority; and that he had to prove this sundry witnesses, whom he named to them: as David Penrhun, Peter Roydon, John Roberts Barker of Ruthin, and Edward Eccles, who were all in our gaol at several times. David Penrhun did not appear; the rest were deposed, who upon their oaths cleared us, and proved our adversary perjured. Moreover, one Robert Clarke, minister of Wrexham, deposed that he heard John Roberts Barker, before named, report how David Penrhun did tell him that I did call the church *domum diaboli*; the which John Roberts denied upon his oath, and so the minister was fore-sworn. Again, there was two gentleman in our gaol for an execution, Mr. Thomas Price Winne of Llanarmon in Yale, and Thomas Lloyd of Abergeley, who offered to depose that Lewis Gronow was in hand with them to bear false witness against me; but they cried on him in these words, 'Fie on thee, fie on thee! thou, being an old man ninety years of age, and wouldst thou have us bear false witness with thee against any man?' In the afternoon the second inquest was called, which went upon life and death. In the mean time John Hughes his wife was examined strictly, to get more evidence for the last inquest; but nothing could be gotten. Here the gaoler had a great charge given him by Sir George to look well unto us three; and so he bound our arms behind our backs with cords, and watched us in the shire-hall all the day fasting, that we looked for present death the next day after. At length the second inquest came in far in the night with their verdict, and said nothing of us. And this is

Lewis Gronow  
 now a  
 perjurer.

A minister  
 a perjurer.

all I can certify at this time. What shall become of us God knoweth, unto whom we commit ourselves and you, with commendations from my fellows, desiring the assistance of your prayers and other good friends for us. Wrex., the 12 of October Anno Dom. 1582. Your daily beadsman,

RICH. WHITE."

At this assize a lamentable chance happened unto a gentleman of good calling, who had been a Catholic and a great benefactor to these prisoners, and was now brought by infirmity and importunity of carnal friends to renounce his faith before the bar, with open protestation; a pitiful example never heard of in Wales before, and no small discomfort to the poor prisoners. But what followed? The gentleman returned home, his soul loaded with sin, his conscience with desperation, his body with punishments so strange and fearful that my tongue doth tremble to utter them, my heart doth bleed to think upon them; but the country doth remember them, and the posterity will talk of them—how far better had it been for him to fall into the hands of men, from whom many ways he might have escaped, at least by death, than to fall into the terrible hands of Almighty God, from whose fingers he might neither dead nor alive escape. Alas, that the constancy of his poor beadsmen could not stay him from so foul a deed, whom he beheld chained and bound hand and foot, ready to offer their lives and blood for that cause which he came to renounce and forsake. But I pray God, that his poor soul may not now answer for this dissimulation before that seat where all our actions must be discussed, where dissimulation can take no place, nor friendship prevail; and that his example may be a warning to other gentlemen to take heed of the like attempt.

At Christmas, after this assize, the new sheriff entering into his office, first removeth from the prisoners their overseers, being able of himself to oversee them sufficiently; then chargeth them with great irons, for the great good will he bare to them.

Jevan  
Lloyd of  
Yale.

At the assize in May 1583, order was taken for their removing to the council of the marches, the which was done with great solemnity, binding their arms fast behind them, *tanquam latrones cum fustibus et gladiis*, as their Master and Captain was sometimes brought before the high-priest. They hoped by torments to wrest from them some evidence against themselves, that they might after with more colour despatch them. Thither was brought to meet these prisoners two

The 6th as-  
size kept at  
Wrexham.

Matt. 26.

young men, prisoners also, from Flint gaol, to be tortured likewise for the same cause, Mr. John Benet and Harry Pue, the one a priest, the other a layman, both right virtuous and constant Catholics; who were all five in November following, at Bewdley and Bridgenorth, laid in the manacles (a kind of torture at the council, not much inferior to the rack at the Tower of London), whereof there is written a special treatise, collected out of divers letters from the said confessors to their friends, of which letters I have selected so much as concerneth our martyr, whereof this is the copy.

*A Copy of a Letter sent from one of the Catholic prisoners to a friend of his, wherein he sheweth the torturing of himself and of his fellows at Bewdley, in Nov. Anno Dom. 1583.*

“Being so often called upon to lay down particular notes of the council’s dealings towards us during the time of our trial and torments, I have collected such things as my fellows and myself could remember to satisfy your request, and conferred diligently therein with them again, lest any untruth had escaped us by overmuch haste in writing. Therefore you shall understand, that Sir George Bromeley sent for John Huges and Robert Moris before him, upon Tuesday, in the morning about eight of the clock, being the 26th of November, etc. The 27th day following, being about eight of the clock in the morning, Mr. Richard White and Harry Pue were brought to Atkins’s chamber, the Queen’s attorney, and all the way as they passed, the people lifted up their hands after them, saying, ‘God save you! God stand with you!’ When they were come before the attorney, he examined them awhile together; and being separated, the said attorney turned him to Mr. White, and said as followeth.

*Atkins.* I protest before God, that the principality of Wales is the third part of the realm wherein no punishment at all hitherto hath been used towards such lewd, obstinate, and disobedient persons; upon whom (as Mr. Justice sayeth) no more mercy ought to be had than on a mad dog, for all Papists be the Queen’s professed enemies.

*White.* You slander them; they are not; and for my part, I do acknowledge her to have full authority in all temporal causes within her own dominions, and so we are taught by our superiors.

*A.* You are contrary to your fellows herein, for Benet calleth the Pope *rex regum*, and he sayeth himself in his own style, *si non valeat verbum Domini valeat gladius Petri*.

*W.* As for Mr. Benet you have forthcoming, let him answer for himself; and as touching the Pope’s style, I know it not, but this that I have told you I believe to be true.

*A.* Wilt thou swear it?

*W.* Will you enlarge me if I do?

*A.* If thou wilt answer directly to such questions as we are



to demand of thee upon thy further reformation, although thou be indicted of treason, yet I will be a suitor for thee to the council, who shall be a means for thee to her Majesty to procure thy pardon. We will not charge thee with any point of religion, but of treason; we will not demand of thee how many sacraments there be, as the Papists did our men in Queen Mary's time, but we will demand of thee when thou hast been first reconciled, by whom, in what place, where hast confessed, how often, and whether thou hast been in confession with Benet or no, sithence he came to the country.

*W.* Do not you know that confession is a point of religion, and one of the chiefest, and in demanding of me such a question you break promise?

*A.* It is no point of religion at all, but the very invention of the Pope to draw subjects thereby from their prince to promise obedience to him, that he may displace the prince to enrich his own coffers. What thinkest thou, may he lawfully displace any prince of his kingdom?

*W.* He doth displace none.

*A.* Now how say you to the Bull of Pius Quintus against our most gracious Queen?

*W.* Notwithstanding that Bull (the which I never saw), I believe and confirm that she is our lawful Queen.

*A.* Doth not the Pope grant pardons and plenaries to such as will kill our Queen?

*W.* I deny that; for he neither doth so, nor yet will do so, nor can if he would.

*A.* He cannot indeed, but it is his common practice so to do: for the late rebels in the north, and Saunders in Ireland, had a Bull from the Pope to invade the realm, to murder the council and the Queen's royal person; and he hath to this end erected seminaries (as nurseries for all disobedient persons to run into), from whence do come those lewd runagate priests, who labour to seduce the people from their obedience to their prince, and to cause an uproar within the realm if it be not prevented in time.

A lie.

Another lie.

The third lie.

*W.* As for the rising in the north, I was not privy thereto, neither to Dr. Saunders going to Ireland, being prisoner at the very same time; therefore you do me wrong to charge me with other men's actions; and as touching the seminaries, I heard it reported that they have the Queen's arms upon their college at Rome, and that they use in both colleges a daily prayer for her Majesty.

*A.* They have the arms of England, but they do not mean the Queen of England; and as for their prayer, they pray, after their seditious manner, that she may be either converted or confounded, and so dost thou.

*W.* When I pray for her Majesty, I make her of no higher degree than a neighbour; for a man is bound to love God above all things, and his neighbour as himself: and I place her under the

highest degree of neighbourhood, contained in the commandment, Honour thy father and mother, &c., but I will not make her my God.

A. She is indeed *pater patriæ*. But to let these words pass, how say you to the premises? Will you answer us directly concerning your reconciliation and confession with Benet within these three weeks, as some of your own fellows do witness.

W. Doth not the Scripture say that the Pharisees and Sadducees came to St. John, confessing their sins and to be baptised?

A. Yes; but that was not auricular confession: peradventure thou wouldst recite another place in the 19th of the Acts (this place Mr. Benet had taught the attorney before), where it is said that the believers confessed their deeds to the Apostles.

And so in the end Mr. White was turned to the manacles about nine of the clock in the morning, upon which torture he was strictly examined by the aforesaid attorney upon the former interrogatives about his reconciliation and confession; who promised him that he should not be delivered from the torments until he would confess the truth. And moreover, he willed him to have regard to himself, being an old man, and not so able to endure the pains as some of his fellows were; and that some had confessed already, and were at ease, as he should be also, if he would do the like. But all these charming words could not prevail against the resolute soul of this constant confessor, who bestowed all the time of his torments in continual prayer, by craving of God for his tormentors mercy and forgiveness, and for himself safe deliverance from their malice by the merits of Christ Jesus His passion; and this he did with a loud voice. But the persecutors seemed to be tormented with his words, as if they had been possessed; for they never ceased running in and out all the while, muttering one to another he knew not what. Then he fell to prayer in silence, and so continued until dinner-time without any answer to their demands; whereat the pitiful men, moved no doubt with compassion, supposing the man to be speechless, took him down, and so left him to remain with his manacles until their coming again. Immediately after dinner came to visit the prisoner Mr. Justice Bromeley, Mr. Townsend, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Leighton of the Plash, Mr. Thelwall, being all of the council; Mr. Atkins, the attorney, Mr. Sherrer, Thomas Evans, deputy-solicitor, and divers others. Then Sir George Bromeley, as one in a great rage, uttered these words.

*Bromeley.* There is no more pity to be had on thee than on a mad dog; and it were better that all such wretches were hanged, than that the state of the realm should be troubled with the like. For it standeth us upon to look unto such, and we are so commanded by the Queen and the council; yea, if we had no authority from above, yet we might do it of ourselves.

W. Sir, if you have authority, either of yourselves or from others, I pray you, put me to death out of hand, and therein you shall do me greater pleasure than to kill me continually in these torments, the which I have felt all this day for my conscience.

*B.* Nay, thou shalt first be tormented, and then hanged afterwards; for thou art indicted of high treason, and I cannot help thee, unless upon thy reformation I stay the verdict of the quest, or else reprieve thee; and if thou wilt do no service to the Queen, if the quest refuse to cast thee, I will have them all to London; but if thou wilt detect and bewray such treasons as are to be asked of thee, we will do for thee, and if thou fear to lose thy benefactors, we will provide that thou shalt live as well as thou dost now; nay, not so neither, but thou shalt have a competent living to live withal. And if thou tell more than Robert Moris hath done, thou shalt be better looked unto; for he hath confessed already, and is now at ease.

*W.* *Etiam innocentes cogit mentiri dolor.*

*Sherrer.* Sir, he can work well in a garden; he hath sometimes been my man, and now he hath wife and children.

*Phillips.* If he will forsake his religion, he shall be my man and gardener too.

*A.* Indeed, I must say that he is more sensible, and can yield better reason for himself than Benet, who calleth the Pope *rex regum*, for he sayeth that the Pope hath a temporal sword in England.

*B.* Yea, that Benet, he had rather dispense with the Pope's laws, which are so far, than with the Queen's laws, which be so nigh.

*W.* The Pope is a priest, and he meddleth not with the temporal sword, which belongeth to kings and princes; for priests may not fight with the sword.

*B.* We are all kings and priests. Well, the time passeth away; if thou answer not directly about thy reconciliation and confession with Benet, &c., thou must needs go to the tortures again.

*W.* Where did you read in all the Scriptures that Christians did compel any by tortures to be of their religion? but we read that Christ whipped the unworthy out of the Temple.

*B.* It is written in the Gospel, 'Go out into the highways, and compel them to come in,' and so we do the like.

*P.* I pray, sir, to pardon him this time from the manacles until the morning.

*B.* Well, I am content; and now I pray thee, White, what didst thou give for thy wife?

*W.* Sir, that question is no point of religion.

And so the council, laughing, departed, and Mr. White was turned over to confer with Sherrer.

*E.* Sir, this man hath been confessed with Benet the priest within these three weeks, and there are witnesses against him of his own fellows, and yet he will not confess it.

*S.* What, dost thou deny a truth? he that denyeth a truth denyeth Christ, for Christ is the truth; thou denyest the truth, *ergo* thou denyest Christ!

*W.* I deny neither Christ nor the truth, because I say nothing.

*S.* To say nothing or to conceal a truth, is the denying of the truth.

W. Then this post denyeth the truth, for it saith nothing.

S. I am sorry with all my heart that I have spoken for thee, and make full account thou shalt to the tortures again.

And so Sherrer departed, and Mr. White remained in the same place with his manacles two long hours after, expecting when he should be laid in them again ; but God protected him from any further cruelty at that time.

[To be continued.]

---

---

## Correspondence.

### CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

SIR,—There are many reasons why the question of Catholic ecclesiastical education should be assuming special importance at the present day. The rapid increase in the number of our priests during the last few years ; the probability that, if the stream of conversions continues to flow, their ranks may be more largely recruited than has hitherto been the case from the higher classes of society ; and the prominence with which Catholic claims and interests are almost daily forcing themselves, in various shapes, on public notice,—these, and other reasons which might be mentioned, make it important to consider whether any modifications, and of what nature, are desirable in the system of our schools and colleges. As I am not writing an essay on the subject, but simply suggesting points for the consideration of those better qualified to judge, I shall make no apology for briefly jotting down a few questions that have occurred to my own mind, without of course professing to have exhausted their bearings, or to have met, in the brief compass of one letter, all the difficulties they may involve.

First, then, as regards the question of *separate* training for the clergy from boyhood, it seems to me that two questions may be raised, viz. how far it is *per se* desirable, and further, how far, if Catholicism should attain that social position in England which it is of course the prayer and desire of every Catholic that it speedily may, such a system would be even possible. I am far from saying that there would not be room for a St. Sulpice in England ; but I cannot help thinking that if the class of men who are trained for the Protestant ministry at our public schools and universities are to be enlisted for the service of the altar, a very different system from that of St. Sulpice would be found necessary, at least for many of them. But, to take the question on its abstract merits, is it altogether desirable that the line of demarcation should be rigidly drawn, and that at an early age ; even where vocations develop themselves thus early, which cannot surely *always* be the case ? The mixture of those

who are training for the Church with those who are preparing for the army, or the bar, or the medical profession, or the service of the state, is, I suppose, the main secret of the great moral and social influence of the Anglican clergy. Are we wise in altogether dispensing with such an advantage, even though we need it *in dealing with our own people* less than they? Dr. Newman's newly-started school at Birmingham professes to be intended for boys not designed for the ecclesiastical state; but some who had been educated there might of course turn out to have vocations, and I presume it would be no matter of regret to its illustrious founder if that should be the case. And after all, is the training required for boys who are to be Christian priests so very different from that of those who are simply to be Christian gentlemen? There must surely be very much in common between the general, as distinct from the special and directly professional, training of the two.

Closely connected with this question comes that of restrictions on reading, which are, I believe, usually imposed in Catholic colleges, and in some cases with a rigour which practically taboos all acquaintance with general literature during the period of school-life. I would not for a moment be supposed to underrate the immense importance of preserving purity. But *is* it preserved by this artificial system, even supposing it to be consistently carried out (which is scarcely possible), and not frustrated by any of the underhand contrivances which such a discipline is but too likely to engender? I should like to ascertain whether the same result could not be attained by other means, and whether the end *is* really secured which alone could compensate for the almost inevitable consequences of depressed imagination and stunted intellectual development, which must place the man trained on such a system at a grave disadvantage in his subsequent career, in his dealings with those differently educated, and especially in his dealings with Protestants. It is surely the *general* rule that precisely those whose intellect is least exercised, and whose imagination is most sluggish, are the readiest and most helpless slaves of the merely animal passions. Nor should it be forgotten that the more rigidly you narrow the limits of general information and thought, the more will the mental faculties be dwarfed, and the more exclusively will attention be concentrated, with a morbid and microscopic pertinacity, on petty criticisms of personal and domestic details. How far these consequences, or any of them, actually follow under our present system I am not now discussing; but certainly one does hear statements, on seemingly good authority, which would go far to show that the danger is not altogether a chimerical one.

No one would desire, especially at the present day, to lower the standard of theological acquirement among our clergy, but rather to raise it. The question is, whether that previous general education, the paramount importance of which has been so conclusively vindicated by Dr. Newman in his *University Lectures*, and which is admitted in all other cases to be the best foundation for a superstructure

of professional knowledge, be not *at least* equally important in the case of a science which has so close an interdependence on other branches of knowledge as theology, and in the case of men whose professional duties must necessarily bring them into contact with such various and divergent phases of human life and thought. To take but one instance, which may serve as a type of many others ; I mean the average standard of Catholic preaching in England. Why is it that, while the Protestant minister, ignorant for the most part of theology, fluctuating and uncertain in his views, and diffident of his authority as a teacher, can usually secure at least the respectful attention of an ordinary congregation to his stammering exposition of a mutilated creed, the Catholic priest, with his far more accurate theological knowledge, his well-ascertained principles of moral and dogmatic truth, and his unhesitating belief in that message from heaven which he, and he alone, is divinely commissioned to deliver, is but too often felt to be the utterer of pointless truisms, which fail to impress the intellect or to touch the heart ? Allowance must of course be made for the stress of work which weighs down many of our overtasked secular clergy ; but I can hardly think this is the *whole* explanation of a phenomenon precisely the reverse of what we should *a priori* have expected. Does not that intellectual refinement, that power of varied illustration, that mastery of language and thought, which are the result of an educated taste and fair acquaintance with the standard literatures, both prose and poetry, of our own and other countries, avail in the one case to light up the broken shadows of an unsatisfying religion with a glory not their own ; while, in the other, truths the most absorbing and sacred which tongue can utter, or heart of man conceive, fall dull and powerless on ears accustomed to that richness of poetic inspiration which has tuned the voices of the world, but seems wanting to the utterances of the sanctuary ? I shall be reminded, perhaps, of what is said about "the foolishness of preaching." Truly, if we had the zeal and sanctity of apostles, all subordinate gifts would be comparatively indifferent ; yet even St. Paul did not disdain to address the fastidious audience of Athens in a language which commanded their attention before it won their faith.

So much for the intellectual side of the question. But it has another aspect, and, to my mind, of far deeper importance, which I cannot wholly pass over, though it is impossible in the narrow limits of a letter to do more than briefly indicate its most salient points. I speak of that moulding of the affections and development of character which, as it is inconceivably the noblest, so is it also the most anxious and difficult portion of education, and on which far more than on mere intellectual training a man's future necessarily depends. Am I wrong in thinking that here too there are features in our existing system which suggest matter for grave reflection, if not for serious alarm ? There are, broadly speaking, and subject to various modifications on either side, two main principles on which the discipline of school life may be conducted, which for convenience I

will designate the principle of confidence and the principle of police. The latter is, I believe, the ordinary system of Continental colleges, whether Catholic or not. The former is, and has been growingly for many years, that usually recognised in England. There are, again, two ways of moulding character—by influence or by routine ; by guiding the affections, or by seeking to crush them. Let me say a word on each of these points.

We have most of us heard or read of Dr. Arnold's famous *dictum*, when he went to Rugby, "I shall always believe a boy's word, till he is proved to be a liar ;" and we also remember the result which his biographer has recorded—that it soon became a general feeling in the school, "it's a shame to tell Arnold a lie, because he always believes it." From an opposite principle an opposite result would have as surely followed. "Give a dog a bad name, and hang him," has passed into a proverb. Both it and its converse are equally and infallibly true. Is this principle recognised, or is it not rather too apt to be ignored in our English Catholic colleges ? It will perhaps be said that the material they have to manipulate is frequently such as to forbid confidence,—that the principle of honour is non-existent. For argument's sake, let us admit it ; then all the more reason for strenuously evoking a principle which lies at the root, not indeed of all sanctity, but of all which goes to make up the complex character of the gentleman ; and which, if it is most valuable in all cases, is certainly not least so for a priest. Of this I feel very sure, at least in dealing with Englishmen (and of them alone I am now speaking), that the measure of trust will always in the long run be the measure of trustworthiness. And of this too there can hardly be a doubt, that a system which simply produces a slavish and material obedience, without evoking any moral respect for the authority which commands, is not only not beneficial, but absolutely and fatally injurious to the character. The blind obedience of a Jesuit novice is a grand and sacred thing. But every one has not the vocation to be a Jesuit, and nobody can become one before a certain age. The blind obedience of a body of school-boys, whether ecclesiastical or not, enforced by a vigorous system of police inspection, will invariably end in the Spartan principle, that there is no disgrace in dishonesty, but much disgrace in being caught ; and that successful lying is a commendable ingenuity, where assertion is not accepted as an evidence of truth. Such a system, as I once heard remarked, may occasionally make a saint by accident ; but its natural tendency is to make sneaks by the score.

I have left myself but little room to speak of the guidance of the affections, a subject on which volumes might be written, but on which I will content myself here with but few words. It will scarcely be denied that they are as integral a part of our composite nature as the intellect or the will,—of our nature not simply as fallen and defiled, but as it came fresh and beautiful from its Creator's hand. And of this, as of all other radical facts of human nature, it is eminently true *neglectum sui ulciscitur*. F. Faber has remarked some-

where, if I remember rightly, that the affections are the natural basis on which all holiness is founded. At all events it is obvious that two things which have ever been marked characteristics of the saints, and are most essential qualifications for the priesthood, would naturally base themselves on the affections; I mean zeal for souls and sympathy for sinners. To say this is not to deny that both gifts are supernatural, or that they may, in special cases, be infused quite independently of natural disposition. But I am speaking of the ordinary laws of God's providence, and *gratia se accommodat nature* is a recognised principle of theology. Without at all disparaging the immense importance of intellectual gifts and acquirements for the work of the priesthood in this day and country, I do not hesitate to express my conviction that a warm heart is *more* important even than a vigorous mind. Of two priests, the one with a brilliant intellect and cold heart, the other of mediocre ability and strong sympathies, I feel little doubt that, *cæteris paribus*, the latter would do more work for God and souls than the former. If this be in any sense true, there is grave reason for mistrusting any system which tends to crush the affections as the price of preserving vocation. To treat all characters as identical, and stretch all varieties of moral and intellectual *ἥθος* on the same Procrustean bed, is doubtless a simpler and easier process than to mould and guide their all but infinite diversities by personal influence and discriminating sympathy. Only, while the highest result which the former system can contemplate is a statuesque model of frigid and unattractive excellence, the danger is great in all cases, and almost certain in many, of either ruining vocation or mutilating character probably for life. The obstructed river will break its banks, and the crushed energies of repressed affection will sooner or later find or form for themselves in some wild outbreak of passionate restlessness that vent which a cramping system had attempted to deny them. I cannot enter now on a proof of the oft-quoted proverb, *naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret*, which is also a first axiom both of philosophy and of common sense; but I would venture with all diffidence to ask one simple question. Is it or is it not desirable that precisely the noblest, the tenderest, the bravest natures, those which have the keenest sympathies, and therefore the widest possibilities of influence, whether for good or for evil, should on that very account be cashiered from the ranks of the priesthood, excluded from that one sphere where all their energies would find their highest expression in rallying the lost ones round the Redeemer's cross? For myself, in the name of common charity, of our common humanity, in the name of that Gospel which reckons among its most glorious triumphs the impetuous affection of the Prince of the Apostles, the self-sacrificing zeal mixed with most tender-hearted sympathy of the great Doctor of the Gentiles, and the ardent devotion of the "disciple whom Jesus loved," I do not hesitate to answer, No! Nor let it be said that to check the individual expression of the affections is to increase the capabilities of their range. All facts go to prove, what our knowledge of human nature would



have led us *a priori* to expect, that precisely the opposite is the case. The man who has no affections in particular will have little to show for the world at large. An abstract philanthropy is a very fine thing, but it always breaks down in practice. On the other hand, when individual sympathies are the keenest and the warmest, they are also the readiest to overflow on all who are brought within the range of their attraction. How immense, then, must be the importance of early training, when the character is yet unformed, when the affections are far more prominently developed than the intellect, when each kindly act or word may be rich in future harvests of priceless benediction, and each omission of a kindly act or word, how much more a harsh and unsympathetic coldness, may be fraught with mischief which after years will never be able to repair.

And now I have concluded, not indeed all that I could say on a well-nigh exhaustless subject, and one to which I am painfully conscious of having done most inadequate justice, but all that I have room to say here. Let me repeat what I said at the beginning, that I am seeking rather to ventilate the question than to lay down the law. My aim is not to complain of past defects, if such there be, which may be abundantly explained by the circumstances of the Church in this country, but to suggest inquiry for the future.

Your obedient servant,  
X. Y. Z.

### THE SIGNS OF MARTYRDOM IN THE CATACOMBS.

SIR,—Two redoubtable champions propose to meet in your pages, to debate the authenticity of certain relics taken from the Roman Catacombs; and your correspondent "J. P.," while bidding them speak out freely, hopes that no scandal may be given, or rather taken, by the expected encounter. I do not propose by this letter to interfere in any way between the parties in this controversy; but this mention of possible scandal suggests to me, that you may perhaps permit me to say a few words on what there is at stake, and how little we have to dread, with whomsoever victory should ultimately rest.

No doubt there would be, not only the fear, but the certainty of scandal, if any one whose initials are as recognisable as "J. S. N." were to tell us that a judgment had been reversed which we have been taught to regard as irreversible. No theory can survive a failure in practice, and a profession of infallibility must succumb before the *a-posteriori* argument of a reversal of judgment. The initials so generally recognised create for me a probable opinion of the fact of a judgment having been so reversed; and I hope that you may agree with me, that a few minutes may not be misspent in considering the character of the previous sentence now departed from. We think none the worse of the judgment of the Court of

Queen's Bench because we have seen cases in which that judgment has been revoked by the House of Lords on appeal. Is the decree of the Congregation of Rites (now, it is stated, recalled) of a similarly judicial and reversible nature, or does it partake of the supernatural infallibility of the definitions of the Apostolic See?

Few persons bear in mind that, even in matters of faith and morals, the Church is accustomed to issue decisive judgments in which she does not claim to exercise her full powers of infallibility. For instance, many think that before the definition of the Immaculate Conception, that doctrine was quite an open question, to be accepted or denied (at least privately) with impunity. But this is not true. To deny it then was not *heretical*, as it is now; but there are many ecclesiastical censures of propositions fatally condemnatory, yet short of heresy. If it was before 1854, as grave writers said, *a theological conclusion*, deduced, that is, from revelation, but by theologians, and not as yet by the Church herself, then was its contradiction *proximate to heresy*, to use the technical term. In this position exactly is the proposition that declares that deaconship is a sacrament. It cannot be denied without incurring this same note of *proximate to heresy*,—the strongest form of error short of heresy itself,—because theologians have found it in revelation, though the Church has not declared it to be there.

Of those condemnatory notes there are various degrees, into the examination of which I do not propose to enter, as I have sufficient to do in considering that which I have brought this to illustrate. It is plain that the presence of the element of human reason is that which removes an ecclesiastical definition more and more widely from the certainty of divine faith. Yet there are some human ingredients that either do not weaken or weaken but little the force of the sentence. Whenever it is necessary for the adequate performance of the work with which the Church has been intrusted, then, though a link in the chain be human, still its coherence and force is divine. The children of the Church would not practically be guarded from hurtful food, and fed on the bread of truth, if she were not infallible in dogmatic facts, and were not able to define, for example, that a certain book contains false doctrine. Hardly less needful for the faithful is the Church's preservation from error in the canonisation of saints; for else she might be proposing to her children as examples of virtue, and commanding them to invoke, those whose lives were not worthy of imitation, and who were powerless to aid them. Thus, though it is not an article of faith that the Church is infallible in her canonisations, no wonder that the voice of theologians pronounces her so to be.

But this relates to canonisation only. The same authority and the same arguments do not apply to beatification. The latter is permissive, and not preceptive; it applies to restricted localities only; and it is the equivalent in the modern discipline for those sentences which were passed in ancient times by particular Bishops or churches, and which received the tacit permission of the Roman

Pontiff. The ancient canonisation may have had a local origin ; but it only became equivalent to the modern solemnity when it was accepted by the Universal Church, and thus become obligatory with the consent of the Pope. This distinction between beatification and canonisation is expressly drawn by Pope Benedict XIV. : *Possibilitas erroris speculative non pugnat cum permissione, sicuti cum præcepto et præsertim quidem cum præcepto Ecclesiam universalem respiciente, ac minime sejuncto ab extremo supremi legislatoris iudicio.\** In beatification there is, therefore, speaking speculatively, a possibility of error.

The absence of infallibility in beatification is in no way owing to the human elements involved in the proceedings, for these equally enter into canonisation ; but it is in consequence of the character of the sentence that it is not preceptive, that it does not affect the whole Church, that it is not the final and definitive judgment of the Vicar of Christ. Yet how great its solemnity is, those who have been present at any of the numerous beatifications that have happily taken place in this pontificate can testify.

A lesser degree of authority will attach to a less solemn judgment ; and that which ranks next to beatification is the approval of *cultus ab immemorabili*. This may be divided into two classes, to which we cannot attach precisely the same sanction ; those cases that have been approved by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and those that have the tacit consent of the Holy See. In the first of these two cases one thing only is done. The sole investigation to which the case is subjected is, whether the honour that is paid to the saint dates from before the year 1534, and has continued uninterruptedly ever since ; for this is the interpretation given by Urban VIII. of his decree forbidding all *cultus* that was not immemorial, that is, that was not of more than centenary standing when his decree was issued, in 1634. The life of the saint is not examined at all, nor is it needful to prove either his virtues or miracles. A somewhat recent instance of this is interesting to us Englishmen. In the thirteenth century, Boniface, of the royal family of Savoy, was Archbishop of Canterbury. The English chroniclers say no good thing of him ; so pertinaciously, indeed, that Father Waterworth, in his work on England and Rome, visits him with a similar condemnation. He died, however, at Haucatacombe, in his native land, on his way from Canterbury to Rome, and there he received the honours of the altar. At the prayer of Charles Albert, Pope Gregory XVI., by a decree dated September 7, 1838, approved of the immemorial veneration he has there received. He is therefore to be numbered amongst our Archbishops as the Blessed Boniface ; for he has received *equivalent beatification*. Far be it from me to intimate that I think that the chroniclers have told the truth concerning him ; on the contrary, there is good reason to believe that they have greatly calumniated him. But it is well worthy of remark, that the documents presented to the Congregation of Rites previous to this decree, which I

\* Ben. XIV. De Canoniz. SS. cap. 64, § 9.

have had an opportunity of perusing, contain no allusion to such accusations. The sole question before the Sacred Congregation was, whether he had or had not received veneration as a saint during a certain number of years; and the decree issued by Pope Gregory XVI. affirms that this was the case. But if a solemn beatification be no infallible sentence, though an examination into the virtues or martyrdom and of the miracles has taken place, sufficient to justify the Pope in proceeding at once to canonisation, if he should think fit, much less can infallibility be claimed for the far less formal judgment of *æquipollent beatification*, papal though it be.

Less still is the sanction bestowed on those cases of immemorial veneration which have the tacit permission of the Pope for their continuance. The case of Charlemagne is a very remarkable instance of this class. In the time of our St. Thomas of Canterbury, Guy of Cremona was Anti-pope under the name of Paschal III. At the desire of the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa, who unites with his own name in his diploma\* that of our King Henry II., who was then dallying with schism, the Anti-pope canonised Charlemagne. Up to this time mass had been said for him, as for others of the faithful departed; but a *cultus* now began, not only at Aix, but generally in France, Belgium, and Germany, which has ever since prevailed; and we remember, when passing through Aix-la-Chapelle, turning over the supplement to the missal there in use, and finding there the proper mass *B. Caroli Magni*. "Whatever we say about the concession made by an unlawful pontiff,"—these are the words of Pope Benedict XIV.,—"so many subsequent lawful pontiffs have known of the concession, and, by their tolerance of it, have admitted it, that if to this we add the observance of this very long lapse of time, there seems to be nothing wanting for the validity of the *cultus* for particular churches, and so for sufficient beatification."†

With *æquipollent beatification*,—to use a technical word in a technical sense,—must be ranked that spiritual patent of nobility, enrolment in the Roman Martyrology. Benedict XIV. speaks very explicitly of errors which have been already corrected, as well as of a few still needing correction—*et pauca quædam menda etiam corrigenda superesse*; and for this he accounts by saying that it contains the names not only of canonised saints, but of others also who

\* This diploma, confirming the privileges of the church of Aix-la-Chapelle, is dated Jan. 8, 1166. It is given by the Bollandists, Jan. 28, vol. ii. p. 888. It reads much more as if the canonisation had been performed by the emperor than by the Anti-pope: *Inde est quod nos gloriosis factis et meritis sanctissimi Imperatoris Caroli confuſenter animati, et sedula petitione carissimi amici nostri Henrici Regis Anglie inducti, assensu et auctoritate Domini Paschalis et ex consilio universorum Principum tum secularium quam Ecclesiasticorum, pro elevatione et exaltatione sanctissimi corporis ejus atque canonizatione, solemnem curiam in Natale Domini apud Aquisgranum celebravimus: ubi corpus ejus sanctissimum . . . cum magna frequentia Principum et copiosa multitudine cleri et populi, in hymnis et canticis spiritualibus cum timore et reverentia elevavimus et exaltavimus* IV. *Kalendas Januarii*,—that is, on the day on which, years after, the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury took place.

† De Canoniz. SS. i. cap. 9, § 3.

have only been subjected to these lesser processes—*sed inscripta quoque in eo reperiuntur aliorum nomina qui in album Sanctorum unquam a Summis Pontificibus relati sunt, sed tantum vel formaliter vel æquipollenter beatificati dici possunt sive per Romanos Pontifices, sive Episcoporum judicio juxta antiquam disciplinam.\**

When the Calendar of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation was submitted to the Holy See, in 1784, when Monsignor Erskine, afterwards Cardinal, was Promotor of the Faith, five English saints whose names occurred in that Calendar were declared in the Decree of Propaganda (June 12, 1784) to be omitted in the Roman Martyrology. These are St. Wereburga, St. Oswald, St. Botolph, St. Etheldreda or Ediltrudis, and St. Benet (Biscop). Yet this statement is erroneous; for though I do not find the names of St. Wereburga or St. Botolph in the Martyrology, yet St. Etheldreda, whom the Benedictines wished to keep on the 17th of October, was already in the Martyrology† on the 23d of June, the day of her death, as *Sanctæ Ediltrudis Reginæ et Virginis*, whom Erskine probably did not recognise. It is worth remarking, that an English Benedictine, who has recited at Matins the lessons from the Sarum Breviary, which were approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on September 7, 1850, and in them the words *sexdecim post annos corpus ejus incorruptum repertum fuerit*, when he comes to sing her elogium from the Martyrology at Prime, says, *undecim post annis*. As, however, they come on different days, he probably does not notice the discrepancy. But both statements cannot be right. The old Martyrology of Maurolycus (Venice, 1576), calling her *Geltrudis*, says, *ab anno decimo*. Moreover, in the edition of the Martyrology by Rosweid, after Baronius (Antwerp, 1613), I find the names of St. Oswald, Aug. 5, and St. Benet (Biscop), Jan. 12.

In all these cases we have instances to which the saying of the same great Pontiff applies, that “in acts which are professions of divine faith, *speculative* truth in the material object is not always required, but *practical* is not unfrequently sufficient, arising from a prudent estimate of the matter.”‡

But facts of a more particular character, and depending for their proof more directly upon human evidence, may enter into, and in a large class of cases *must* enter into, and form the very foundation of the Church's judgment. Such judgments may be passed by the highest tribunal upon earth, the Holy Roman See, and yet be of their very nature reversible and in practice occasionally revoked.

St. Thomas of Aquin, in the *Quodlibet* (q. Art. 16), in which he maintains that the Church cannot err in the canonisation of saints, says, “As to sentences on particular facts, as on possessions, crimes,

\* De Canoniz. SS. cap. 64, § 13.

† See Baronius's edition, which is of course considerably anterior to Erskine.

‡ “In actibus enim divinam fidem protestantibus non semper requiritur veritas *speculativa* ex parte objecti materialis, sed *practica* non raro satis est, ita ut videlicet de eo prudenter existimatur.” Ibid. § 12.

and such like, the judgment of the Church may err through false witnesses." For instance, it *might* happen that a man was excommunicated through false evidence, though truly innocent of the crime of which he was accused ; and while bearing on earth the temporal consequences of the undeserved censure, he might be adding most largely to his store of merits. This is stated explicitly in the Canon Law itself : " We briefly answer your question thus, that the judgment of God ever rests upon the Truth which deceives not and is not deceived ; but the judgment of the Church sometimes follows opinion, which often chances to deceive and to be deceived ; hence it sometimes happens that he who is bound in God's sight is freed in that of the Church ; and he who is free with God is bound by the sentence of the Church."\*

So also in matrimonial causes. In the Congregation of the Council, which is a court from which no appeal lies, which is therefore the Holy See itself deciding, it is by no means uncommon to have the judgment on a case being repropounded *recedendum a decisio*, or, *prævio recessu a decisio* so and so ; almost as common, I was going to say, as the final affirmation of the original sentence, *in decisio et amplius*. On inquiry on the spot as to the reason of judgments being so often reversed on the rehearing, I was told that it arose from the fact that the parties who are in the right very often neglect to plead their case at the first hearing, trusting probably to their sense of right, and forgetful of the power of a skilful advocate to make the worse appear the better cause. Yet the first is an authoritative sentence of the Holy See, and its reversibility, its liability to error, in no way lessens the respect with which such judgment must be received till it is revoked. The *actual* validity of a marriage in no way depends upon this judgment. It was or was not a true marriage in the sight of God before the action was commenced ; and the issue of the trial, whether on the right side or the wrong, cannot alter what was long before ratified in heaven. The Church can only judge by the evidence that is brought before her, and in such cases as these she may be deceived.

So also with respect to particular facts narrated in the lives of the Saints. The Roman Breviary has undergone revisions, in which, as a more critical spirit arose, or the sources of history became more accessible, narratives were altered or rejected which had been recited for a long series of years. This may be done again ; but no one thinks with less respect of the Divine Office because it may contain statements respecting facts which are not in strict accordance with historical accuracy. For instance, it seems most probable that in the lessons for Ven. Bede, approved for our use by the Holy See, his age at the time of his death is misstated.

And now, sir, if you have borne with me thus far, perhaps you will let me ask why a sentence of the highest court on the sacrament of matrimony should be reversible, and a judgment affirming the authenticity of a certain relic or class of relics should not be capable

\* Cap. *A nobis*, 23, de sent. excommunicat.

of reconsideration, and, if necessary, of revocation? There is a passage attributed to St. Augustine to this effect: *Multorum corpora venerantur in terris, quorum animæ cruciantur in inferis*. Like some other texts that have too traditional an existence, it is not to be found in the writings of the saint. But it induces an old theologian\* to say things respecting relics which at least will give no scandal as coming from him.

"St. Augustine does not say (if the passage be genuine, which we deny) that we are wrong in venerating the bodies of those whom the Church has canonised, because their souls are suffering in hell; but that we venerate upon earth many bodies, which we think are the bodies of those whom the Church has declared to be saints, while in fact they are no such thing, but rather bodies of men who are lost and who are suffering in hell, infidels perhaps, assassins, pirates, or robbers, who have died with the worst of characters; but here it is not the judgment of the Church that deceives us, but we are subjected to these deceptions in the veneration of the saints from the vicissitudes through which the Christian republic has passed in the times of Moorish wars or Turkish tyranny. For the Church has decreed that St. Jerome is to be venerated and honoured; but she has nowhere defined by her judgment that this body, which we think to be St. Jerome's, is truly his body. So she has determined that St. John the Baptist is to be honoured with the greatest veneration; but from this it does not follow that it is certain by the Church's judgment that this head which we think is St. John's is his beyond a doubt; for perhaps it is some one else's. But if the Church were so to determine, having previously visited and diligently examined it, we must say that God would not permit the Pope to be deceived in this and to deceive us. And we constantly assert that, even though this doubt exists, veneration is to be shown to those relics which, either by the common opinion of Christians or by a great consent of prelates, are held to be those of saints. For though in this an error might happen, yet it is not to be presumed in a matter of such moment, and bearing so near a relation to religion."

The presumption is in favour of the relics being what they are professed to be, but in each case there is a possibility of error. If it were not so, how did St. Charles Borromeo come to have it said of him that he would not let men rest even when they were dead, such was his care in examining into the authenticity of relics, and such his zeal in rejecting those that would not satisfactorily bear his tests.

Pope Innocent III., in the Council of Lateran (cap. *Cum ex eo*), reserved to the Holy See the examination and approbation of all newly-discovered relics; but the Council of Trent (Sess. 25, *De venerat. Sanct. et Imag.*) conferred this power upon all Bishops: *Nulla admittenda esse nova miracula, nec novas reliquias recipiendas, nisi*

\* Covarr. tom. 2, oper. variar. resolut. lib. i. cap. 10, no. 13, apud Ben. XIV. De Canoniz. SS. loc. cit.

*recognoscente et approbante Episcopo, qui simul atque de iis aliquid compertum habuerit, adhibitis in consilium theologis, et aliis piis viris, ea faciat quæ veritati et pietati consentanea judicaverit.* The Council does not even require the same formality as it orders in the promulgation of an indulgence, in which two canons of the cathedral have to take part. Such matters do not, therefore, require the judgment of the Church and the Pope; and when a Roman congregation gives a judgment, it simply means that the question cannot be reopened by any save itself, as the case in which a Bishop gave sentence might be. Who is to consider such decrees irreversible, if the Holy See itself does not do so? I do not think we need fear, though it has taken me many words to say why, lest, though "J. S. N." should show that the Sacred Congregation of Rites no longer regards as conclusive proof of martyrdom that which it once did so regard, any should be so foolish as to take scandal thereat.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. M.

## Literary Notices.

*A Visit to the Philippine Islands.* By Sir John Bowring, LL.D., F.R.S. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1859.)—*Story of New Zealand, past and present, savage and civilised.* By A. S. Thomson, M.D. 2 vols. (London: Murray, 1859.) A comparison between the Philippine Islands and New Zealand would furnish a good test of the Spanish and Catholic as compared with the English and Protestant mode of treating the aborigines of colonised territories. Since the days of our buccaneers and Sir Walter Raleigh, it had been the custom to denounce the exterminating policy of the Spaniards, till Mr. Helps' delightful volumes taught a new lesson to those who would receive it. The proof is in the fact; the Indian has disappeared from our plantations; the Spanish colonies, to whatever state of anarchy and misery they have relapsed since their separation from Spain, are still peopled with men of the aboriginal blood. We have done, and the Spaniards have not done, what we blamed them for doing, and what we intended to teach them how to avoid doing by our superior example. In this we have been made fools of by the event; just as nature, with a bitter irony, has falsified the cry of the French revolutionists, "Primogeniture has but one child," and the infinite division of property has become the occasion of a real, and not only a metaphorical, sterility.

Sir John Bowring contrasts this aspect of Spanish and English colonisation. "The more enterprising invaders of Gothic or Anglo-Saxon blood have frequently exterminated the indigenous races of the remote countries in which they have settled. One wave of emigration has followed another; commerce and cultivation have



created a demand for, and provided a supply of, the intrusive visitors. But Spain has never furnished such numbers as to dislodge the aboriginal tribes. Her colonists have always been accompanied by large bodies of ecclesiastics, bent upon bringing 'the heathen' into the Christian fold. These missionaries have no doubt often stood between the cupidity of the conqueror and the weakness of the conquered. They have preserved, by protecting, the Indian clans ; and Sir John doubts whether their influence will not, on the whole, prove beneficial, though he recognises it as a law of nature "that the savage and least improvable races will continue to be supplanted or absorbed by those of a higher civilisation."

To the English mind it seems yet an unsolved problem, whether a great material prosperity founded on a great crime should be at once aimed at ; or whether we should be content with the slow development of savage nature, treated with patience and tenderness, which is content to wait centuries for its harvest. We have our stringent laws against cruelty to brutes ; we hesitate whether or not to condemn the wholesale extirpation of whole clans and races of men.

The absence of this patience, not only in the lay, but in the missionary element of English colonisation, is well exemplified in a case that has occurred in New Zealand. Most people have heard of the *tapu* or *taboo* of the Maori ; it was the religious sanction of the law ; it made certain things and persons sacred and inviolable ; such as the priests and chiefs, human flesh, dead bodies, persons engaged in planting, food, the sick, the first-fruits, and many other things. Many ceremonial inconveniences followed from the system, and in many of its parts it was superstitious ; but it was a real and powerful check on the conscience. But the missionaries have decreed that Christianity and *Tapu* cannot coexist, and the system is accordingly dying out, with marked injury to the morals and honesty of the natives.

But if the missionaries had been actuated with the spirit of the first apostles of Christianity, they would have done the exact contrary. The Latin *sanctus* was almost identical with the Maori *tapu*. By the Roman law, tribunes, ambassadors, and walls and gates of cities, were all *sancti* ; every thing connected with religion, all that was venerable and inviolable, was *sanctum*. No doubt there were tiresome ceremonies connected with this "superstition ;" but the first Christians did not destroy the good on account of the rust of error which it had contracted ; on the contrary, they adopted this notion of sanctity, purified it, extended it, and made it the foundation of morals and religion. The Maori *tapu* might have been treated in the same way, and would have been so treated if the missionaries had been like the Jesuits in China, who were so abused for the use they made of heathen customs, instead of ignorant and impatient Calvinists. On the other side, one of the Spanish friars in the Philippine Isles writes : "The tree must bear its fruit ; God in His wisdom has made many races of men, as He has made many

varieties of flowers; and at last I reconciled myself to seeing the Indians do every thing differently from what we should do; and keeping this in view, I could mould them like wax to my purpose."

This is the difference of the two systems. One is content to *grow*, the other is impatient to *do*; one, therefore, is tolerant, the other intolerant; or as the English would say, one is lazy, the other energetic. But the one improves the poor degraded savages that it takes in hand, leads them patiently by the hand for centuries of feebleness, till they forget their superstitions, and are ready to take their place in the world; the other wants to pull up the savage at once to its own level, and breaks the feeble brains by requiring more than they can perform; in its impatience it destroys the only foundation on which the superstructure of permanent improvement could be raised; and then, when it has doubly degraded the already fallen savage, it pronounces him hopeless, and condemns him to pitiless extermination.

Of the two books which we have placed at the head of this notice, Sir John Bowring's is the most remarkable, as it treats of a subject new to English literature. Dr. Thomson's volumes appear to be a careful compilation by a person well acquainted with the islands.

*Statistisches Jahrbuch der Kirche (Annual of Ecclesiastical Statistics)*. By P. Charles of St. Aloysius, Barefooted Carmelite of Wurzburg. (Ratisbon, 1860.) We wish to draw attention to this important undertaking, because it can only be made complete and accurate by being widely known, and by receiving contributions and corrections from different countries. The author published a book on the same subject fifteen years ago, and he has used, he tells us, every opportunity in the interval between the two publications to obtain the most correct details. This volume contains an account of the number of episcopal sees, of the secular clergy, and of the religious orders at the present time. The Catholic inhabitants of Europe are estimated at 146,000,000; America, 40,000,000; Asia, 5,000,000; Africa, 4,000,000; Australasia, 5,000,000; or 200,000,000 Catholics in all. This is probably about 10,000,000 too high, even if we allow the figure of speech by which France is said to contain a population of 33,000,000 Catholics. The whole number of episcopal sees in the Catholic Church is 891, of which 602 are in Europe, 140 in America, 96 in Asia, 30 in Africa, and 23 in Australasia. Of these bishops 108 are in the dominions of the Queen of England, more than belong at the present date to any other power; whilst 236 are in Italy alone. Our author gives 286,000 as the whole number of secular priests throughout the Church, of whom 260,000 are in Europe. In this there is, however, an excess of nearly 19,000, as by an inexplicable blunder the number of Sicilian clergy, 7600, is estimated at 26,304. The statistics of the regular clergy are far more difficult to ascertain. Our author reckons 7065 religious houses of men, containing 96,636 individuals, 9247 convents, and more than 100,000 nuns. This is probably rather un-

derrated.' The different congregations of reformed Franciscans form still, as they have always formed since the days of their glorious founder, the most numerous of all the orders. They have about 2000 houses and 25,000 religious, the Capuchins nearly half as many, and the Conventuals 4000. The Jesuits, who at the time of their suppression were 22,000, are now about 6000, increasing more rapidly perhaps than any other order. They have 226 houses. The Sisters of Charity are reckoned at 12,000 in 2000 houses. The whole number of religious orders of men is given at 83, that of the female orders at 94. It is not in things that can be represented by figures that the prosperity and promise of the Church can be discerned in our time. At the end of eighteen centuries of apostolate, she has still eight hundred millions of worshippers of false gods surrounding her, presenting an inexhaustible and almost inaccessible field for her missionary labours. Her growth has not been in expansion so much as in intensity. Her history has been a succession of external losses, which have given an impulse to successive victories over imperfect and rebellious elements within. First, Islamism, an outward foe, overran Asia and Africa, destroyed the Churches in two vast continents, and invaded the eastern and western extremities of southern Europe. Then the Eastern separated from the Western Church, and she who three centuries before had flourished throughout civilised Africa, and as far as central Asia, found herself restricted to the western half of Europe. That is the period in which religion most deeply penetrated the masses, and shone with the most intense lustre. It is the period of her utmost compression, from the eastern schism to the discovery of a new world, that we call by the mournful title of the Ages of Faith. They were the ages when zeal was warmest and when faith was purest. Then, when a new hemisphere was added to her domain, Protestantism arose, and carried away the north of Europe. And now the prophecy of an ancient writer is fulfilled; the age of suffering from tyrants is long gone by, the age of heresy is near its end, and the age of persecution by false brethren has arrived. A new danger, that of unbelief, saps the foundations of the Church, and must lead to a new apostasy. Protestantism was the seduction of the Teutonic race; unbelief is the temptation of the Roman. The Reformation and the wars of religion drove the centre and stronghold of religion to the southern countries, which were farthest from the danger, and for more than two centuries Catholicism bore a strong local colouring from the Italian, Spanish, and French character, a thing unknown to the Catholic middle ages. But now those who guarded the Church from the Teutonic Reformation have risen against her, and she finds in the lands beyond the Alps, the Rhine, and the sea, her most devoted children and her most able pastors. The revival of Gothic art is one of the most visible, but one of the least important symptoms of the mediæval renaissance which marks our age, as the revival of paganism marked the age of the Medici, and of that protest and reaction of the Teutonic mem-

bers of the Church which has been provoked by the rising of the Roman nations against her. A great work of internal regeneration appears to be, far more than distant conquests, her special and peculiar vocation in our day.

It seems as if the distant nations of the world needed to be brought within the range of European civilisation before the necessary conditions for their conversion can be obtained. Four thousand years elapsed between the fall and the redemption of man, during which the human race laboured to accomplish those ends which were preliminary to the coming of Christ. The chief instruments of the early expansion of the Church were the Hellenic world at the height of its intellectual cultivation, and the Teutonic race, when it had preserved above all barbarians the primitive virtues of humanity. Those were among the signs of the fullness of time for the nations that have ruled the world. But the mass of barbarians in this age have fallen far below the ancient Germans in ignorance, and the Greeks and Romans in corruption. Unless they are raised in the scale of humanity, they can hardly be fitted for Christianity. A natural process must take place in each country to prepare it for the truth, corresponding to that which led the civilisation of antiquity to desire and to look for a new revelation. Christ comes to each nation only when an angel has gone before Him to make straight His paths, and to awaken the expectation and aspirations which lead to faith. Thus it happened to the apostles that "when they had passed through Phrygia and Galatia, they were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia; and when they were come into Mysia, they attempted to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not. But, on the other hand, "a vision was showed to Paul in the night, which was a man of Macedonia standing and beseeching him, and saying, Pass over into Macedonia and help us" (*Acts* xvi. 6, 7, 9).

---

## Current Events.

### HOME AFFAIRS.

#### *Parliamentary Reform.*

*May 3.* The Reform Bill was read a second time, without a division, after a debate of six nights. The course of the discussion was from first to last unfavourable to the Bill, which was opposed by many of the supporters of the Government, as well as from the Opposition benches. Lord Palmerston, together with the majority of his colleagues, abstained from speaking. The speeches which excited the greatest interest and attention were those of Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer and Mr. Gregory—the former a great performance in a literary point of view, but destitute of the power of statesmanlike eloquence; the latter highly instructive, but hardly applicable to the question under discussion. Yet Mr. Gregory's speech exhibited, more clearly than any other, the temper of the House of Commons with regard to the Reform Bill. It was a striking and authentic account of political observations made on a tour in the United States—a warning against democracy founded on the example of America. None of the arguments told against the admission of a democratic element in the State, because they were derived exclusively from a country where democracy is supreme and unmingled with other balancing elements. It was not even fair as an attack on democracy; for it assumed that in America there are no disturbing causes to explain the unfavourable contrast which it offers to the older European democracies. Yet Mr. Gregory was heard with delight, and loudly applauded throughout, from every quarter of the House. An additional proof of the fear and dislike in which Mr. Bright is held was the constant series of attacks directed against him by a great number of Liberal speakers.

The most remarkable argument in favour of the principle of the Bill was delivered by Mr. Monckton Milnes; the best arguments against it, by Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Macaulay, who showed that some

constituencies are already swamped by the democratic element. Qualification, said Mr. Macaulay, is a local question, to be determined by the social distribution of each constituency. The franchise, to be adapted to the real condition of the nation, must be multifarious. These objections were not answered by Mr. Gladstone, who effectually disposed of all the general arguments against the propriety of admitting the working-classes to the franchise, which had been urged especially by Mr. Black and Sir E. Bulwer. "Is it," he said, "altogether just to hold the language that has been held with respect to the inferior qualities of the working-man? Sir, I don't admit that the working-man, regarded as an individual, is less worthy of the suffrage than any other class." What we fear is not the bad qualities of the individual, but the numbers of the whole class. The claims of labour are as legitimate as the claims of property, and the working-classes may justly demand that their importance in the country should be represented in the State. The danger is from the mass, not the class, of working-men. In reply to this difficulty, Mr. Gladstone showed, and it is the most important argument used in favour of the Bill—in detail that the addition to the borough constituencies would be extremely moderate. "Are the working-classes to have the lion's share? What is the position of the working-classes in regard to the constituency of the country? You have already got a constituency of 410,000; you are going to add 150,000, or at the most extravagant estimate 200,000. That is 660,000. You have got a county constituency of 530,000. We expect to add about 150,000, making in all 686,000. Adding the Universities, the total constituency of England is 1,345,000. That number will be very largely diminished on account, of course, of plurality of votes. I cannot estimate the diminution; but I imagine it would diminish the total number by not less than one-sixth, and the gene-

ral result would be, that after popularising your representation in a country with a population of 20,000,000 and with 5,000,000 adult males, you would have a constituency of about 1,100,000, or 1,200,000. Surely a system which enfranchises one-fourth part of your adult males, and selects that one-fourth part, upon the whole, with great judgment and discretion, is not a very unreasonable system." The great majority of the House were pledged to reform. The Opposition could therefore only try to delay the progress of the Bill as much as possible, without declaring themselves decidedly against it. In a session in which there was so much important business of other kinds, the Fabian policy had a great chance of success. This was increased by a signal victory obtained by the Opposition before the time came when the Reform Bill was to be considered in Committee.

*May 8.* The third reading of the Bill for the Abolition of the Paper Duty was carried in the House of Commons by the narrow majority of 219 to 210.

*May 21.* It was thrown out, on the second reading, in the House of Lords, by a majority of 193 to 104. Inasmuch as it was proved that not a single precedent justified an alteration of taxation by the House of Lords, and as this great innovation was admitted on the ground of urgent necessity, it was a severe blow to the Government in its most popular element.

*May 25.* A committee was appointed by the House of Commons to search for precedents for the course taken by the peers. Meantime, however, the news from China, making it certain that great additional sums would be required for the war, supplied a practical justification of the rejection of a bill which would have caused a loss to the revenue this year of more than 800,000*l.* It reduced the matter to a question simply of constitutional privilege, and prevented the great excitement which might otherwise have arisen. It has been felt that the Lords have done no small service to the country, and the result has been so far greatly to enhance their authority, and to weaken the position of the ministry. In this unexpected manner, whilst

a Reform Bill was being carried through the House of Commons, the influence which it threatened to exercise on the balance of the constitution has led to a strong reaction, and a revival of the Conservative power in the country.

*June 4.* The Reform Bill was again brought forward previous to going into committee. A great number of instructions, intended to gain time, were found to be out of order. In the face of this policy of delay and procrastination, and considering that one of the chief objections to the Bill was the dislike of an early dissolution, Lord John Russell announced that the Scotch and Irish Reform Bills would not be brought forward this session. This step, which was designed to help the English Bill to pass into law this year, had the effect of leading the Opposition to abandon its Fabian tactics, and to try the chance of a division. It afforded the first plausible opportunity of attempting to throw out the Bill in an indirect way; for it was hoped that Scotch and Irish supporters of the measure would vote against the postponement of the Bills for Ireland and Scotland.

*June 7.* A Scotch member, Sir James Fergusson, moved the adjournment of the debate, on the ground that the English bill ought not to be proceeded with, if the Scotch and Irish bills are postponed. The three measures ought, he said, to be carried at once; and it would be better to bring them forward together next year, than to pass one now and leave the others for the next session. The three Bills were drawn up in harmony, and with reference to each other; and it would be highly inconvenient, in the uncertain state of affairs, to have a different representation for the three countries for an indefinite period, during which a dissolution would be impossible. Several Scotch and Irish supporters of Government voted, as was expected, for this motion. It was negatived by a majority of 269 to 248.

*June 11.* The Government, having asserted its power by a majority of 21, announced the withdrawal of the Bill in consideration of the advanced period of the session. The Opposition had succeeded in the policy of delay, though at the price of a de-

cided victory of ministers, by which they were enabled to sacrifice the Bill to the manifest advantage of the public service, without suffering any loss of influence in the House of Commons. The failure of the Reform Bill, like that of the Paper Bill, fell upon Mr. Bright and his friends; but they have the autumn months before them to agitate the two questions of Privilege and Reform. The prospects of the harvest and the state of the Continent, by which the success of their own French treaty is so much endangered, make it a matter of anxiety whether the reform of the representative system can be undertaken next year under such favourable auspices as those under which it has failed now; and whether the Conservative victory in 1860 will do aught but put off a settlement which none dare refuse to a time when it may be dangerous to concede it. "Tout obstacle," says De Maistre, "qui n'éteint pas une force en augmentant la puissance, parcequ'elle l'accumule."

The events of the session exhibit in the clearest light the character and errors of the two parties that compromise the influence, and promise to endanger the existence, of the State. We are threatened by ideal reformers and by absolute Conservatives, by Radicals and by Tories. Both parties are essentially unconstitutional: one by aiming at results which are not in the constitution, and are inconsistent with it; the other by denying a principle which is part of the constitution, and which is really the *nisus formativus* of its life. Each party is responsible for the existence of the other, in whose extravagance it finds its own justification. On the one hand, stability is invoked on behalf of the classes who possess power and wish to preserve it; on the other, a change is looked forward to which shall accommodate every thing to a new interest. It is mere political idolatry to imagine that the forms of a government are valuable in themselves; the right of prescription cannot apply to the representative part of the constitution. There is no ideal state to be realised, no golden age to be preserved. The wisdom of our ancestors binds us not to its products, but by its example. Together with their laws and institutions we have in-

herited from them the method by which they legislated and governed, and by which we have to improve and modify what they have left us. The greatest proof of their practical wisdom, and the greatest lesson for us is, that they provided so carefully for the wants which were actually felt, and for the circumstances in which they lived, that their laws cease to be suitable to an altered age. Laws and institutions as good for one age as for another, are good for none at all. Prescription has no authority in representation, and the merit of all government lies in representation.

It is only in the domain of nature that the idea is included in the reality, and that all which ought to be is. In the moral world the actual does not correspond with the ideal, and is therefore transient and provisional. It is our duty to endeavour to restore the harmony and correspondence by our own voluntary act. In nature, where the combination always necessarily exists and the idea is always realised, there is nothing but repetition; neither change nor progress. But in the moral world, the obligation of labouring continually to restore the identity of forms with their substance, is a source of perpetual activity and motion. The principle of ideal conservatism is a principle of progress, not of stagnation.

The nation is the substance of which the State is the outward form. Its political must correspond with its social existence and constitution, and be determined by it. It is impossible permanently to dissociate them. Revolutions are either attempts to do so by violent means, or reactions for the restoration of concord. The State is not a natural emanation of the nation, but a product of intelligent thought; and statesmanship is a process of free reflection by which the government is adapted to the people to whom it belongs. But while the particular State is a result of human design, society is more immediately subject to the Divine will. It is less under the control of man, and moves, under the guidance of Providence, by steps so slow and so imperceptible, that we cannot consciously influence their course, or even understand their direction. Now God guides the world by the power of

what are called natural laws, which men cannot alter or divert. It is by observing the uniform and regular action of these laws that the science of the philosophy of history attempts to justify His ways to man. The State is society personified. It possesses a more ethical, society a more physiological, character. In the State, as in the individual, the object of government is to promote the victory of the Divine will, to realise the designs of Providence. In this our own arbitrary speculation and policy must yield as far as possible to the objective results of the Divine action; that is, it must be restrained by reverence for law and for existing circumstances. Society is ever growing, independently of human design, and slowly but constantly modifying and developing its forms. This incessant growth supplies the progressive element in the State, which is moulded upon society and follows its variations. Political progress is a process of adaptation, not a result of speculation. This distinguishes reform from revolution. One is the change produced by the pressure of existing facts, the other by the influence of ideas without reference to facts. Government has thus to follow the example of nature in her operations, and to proceed regularly, organically; by evolution, not by change. Politics is a science of observation rather than of reasoning.

The growth of society demands an alteration of political institutions parallel with its own changes. But human works being devised and made once for all, we cannot bestow on them the power of growth or self-adaptation. We can do no more than make our institutions dependent on society, so that the need of modifying them may be easily felt, and that change may be possible as soon as needed. This elasticity is secured by attaching political forms to actual conditions and requirements of society, so that they may stand, not on their own merits or by their own strength, but by virtue of their harmony with it—not because they are absolutely good, but because they are actually suitable. Where this is understood, there is no dread of change; because, as it follows the social movement, it consists in regular and continuous development. As

growth is one of the laws of life, reform becomes one of the principles of government. An occasional crisis is inevitable, because no human sense can hear the footsteps of social progress, or watch the growth of man. We are aware of it at intervals, when we suddenly discover that the coat no longer fits. It is fortunate when these intervals are not too great, and remedies can be applied to local wants before they have time to kindle a universal discontent. That is the true conservatism which allows nothing to become antiquated or fall into decay.

A constitution may be perfectly symmetrical and ingenious, and yet it will be completely useless unless it coincides with the forms and exigencies of society. This is the only harmony required, and where it subsists the utmost external irregularity is no reproach to it. The energy with which the demand for amended representation is pressed on government depends on the nature of the forces which compose society. Whatever possesses social power necessarily claims political power. This is a law as supreme in politics as the law of gravitation in the material world. It is a consequence of this necessary union of the political with the social constitution, that representative government cannot be considered a particular form, but is the ideal of all political development, to which all other forms are subordinate, and to which in the progress of things they ultimately tend. It belongs essentially to the notion of the State; it is not a matter of choice. No nation can escape it when its time has come, although it may bring injury to many, and trouble to all. Its adoption is a test, not of the health or prosperity, but of the maturity of a nation. For this very reason, because it is the consummation and end of all political development, representative government is not adapted to all times and all places. Feudal aristocracy, absolute monarchy, and republicanism, are equally legitimate, though subordinate and transient, forms of the State. Only an organised society is capable of political representation.

The resources of the State multiply with the development of new social elements in the country, and in



proportion as it succeeds in adopting them, that is, in converting social into political forces. Wherever this is neglected or denied, the excluded element, though perhaps a great source of national prosperity, becomes a source of political weakness, — a foe instead of a friend. Wealth and knowledge are the chief instruments of power, and the chief claimants for political representation. It must therefore be commensurate with, and inseparable from, their extension and increase. As it is the business of civil society to extend the enjoyment of those advantages to ever wider and wider circles; so it is equally the business of the State to extend in the same measure the enjoyment of political rights. It is even the duty of government to accelerate this process, to hasten the necessity of extending the participation of political power, by promoting the increase of those resources which confer the franchise. The whole nation requires to be gradually refined, organised, and elevated into a political society. Where nothing is done to remove the narrow selfishness and inactivity of the lower orders, their existence will always be felt as a burden. Every society is naturally aristocratic, because all men do not possess an equal share of that which gives political power. But as far as moral and material well-being increases, as far as civilised life fulfils its ends, the aristocratic differences disappear, and the aristocratic character of the State fades away. The only means of preventing the circle of the governing classes from extending more and more widely is carefully to preserve ignorance and poverty. This is a policy commonly practised, and it is more reasonable and more consistent than the policy of those who are unwilling to admit the political consequences of the increase of wealth and the growth of education.

The following statistics exhibit in some degree the progress of those political elements in this country during the last generation: In 1818, when the population of England and Wales was 11,642,683, the number of day-scholars was 674,883; of Sunday-scholars, 477,225. In 1833, population, 14,386,415; day-scholars, 1,276,947; Sunday-scholars,

1,548,890. In 1851, population, 17,927,609; day-scholars, 2,144,378; Sunday-scholars, 2,407,642. The proportion of day-scholars to the population was therefore, in 1818, 1 in 17·25; in 1833, 1 in 11·27; in 1851, 1 in 8·36. Of Sunday-scholars the proportion was, in each of those years respectively, 1 in 24·40, 1 in 9·28, 1 in 7·45. The number of depositors in savings-banks was, in 1832, 427,473; and in 1856, 1,331,369. The deposits amounted in the former year to 13,435,969*l.*; in 1859, to 38,968,312*l.*

If all individuals are represented, no class will be represented. The labouring class is a power in the land, and requires its importance to be recognised by the concession of political influence. But if its representation is determined, not by its power, but by its number, — if instead of being weighed it is counted, — no other class, right, or interest will be represented at all. If representation is made a question of arithmetic, government will become a question of arithmetic. The lower class ought to be represented through its best men possessing the franchise. The best men of a lower class are more fitted to exercise political power than the worst men of a higher class. Every class has a proletariat of its own. A skilled artisan is a more trustworthy member of the community than a low shopkeeper, and a wealthy tradesman than an insolvent nobleman. Generally speaking, nobody need fear revolution that does not fear reform; and the objection to reform by instalments proves a total misconception of the due harmony between society and the State, and between the interests of the several orders among themselves. On both sides, and in both extremes, an unworthy jealousy subsists, and men do not recognise the truth that each class prospers by the prosperity of the other. "The eye cannot say to the hand: I need not thy help; nor again the head to the feet: I have no need of you. Yea much more those that seem to be the more feeble members of the body, are more necessary. . . . God hath tempered the body together, giving to that which wanted the more abundant honour. That there might be no schism in the body, but the members might be mutually careful one for another.

And if one member suffer any thing, all the members suffer with it; or, if one member glory, all the rest rejoice with it" (1 Cor. xii. 21-26).

This is what our extreme parties fail to understand; and we stand between one theory which threatens the State with petrification, and another which threatens it with dissolution. The agricultural interest has always had a Conservative, aristocratic character, and industry is as incurably democratic. The latter has gained during the last thirty years a succession of important victories. The prosperity of the State depends on the preservation of the balance between the two. The manufacturing interest had a fair claim to the readjustment which has taken place; but whereas the landed interest resisted that just claim altogether, and sought unfairly to maintain a political preponderance which the condition of society no longer justified, by the same law of the existence of social and political elements, that which has had its legitimate demands conceded to it aims at supremacy, and at the subjection of all other interests to its own. In these ulterior aims it is as unreasonable as the opposite party in the resistance it offered to the early claims of the manufacturers. It is important to distinguish in the democratic party its equitable demands from the exaggerations and usurpations which have sprung from the same original root.

The Manchester school does not profess, like the Americans, an abstract democratic theory, but founds a consistent system upon certain definite interests peculiar to our manufacturing population. This foundation forms its strength and its weakness; whilst it gives a reasonable and legitimate character to the original objects and wishes of the party, it leads to the application of that one criterion of interests to every question, and gives a material character to a whole system of policy. No system can be more complete or consistent in theory, or more logically reducible to one principle. None can be more universal in its practical application. The reason of its rapid progress and of its formidable power is not its theoretical truth, but the fact that it is the product and expression of the interests and opinions

of the most rapidly increasing section of the community. For during a period in which the agricultural population has increased seven per cent, the population of the manufacturing districts has increased thirty-seven per cent, and even the increase of the country population has been far more rapid than it was before the introduction of machinery. The growth of wealth has been still greater. The annual increase of the national wealth, which Porter estimated at 80,000,000*l.*, is almost exclusively due to the manufacturing class. In estimating the power of the class which produced the Manchester school, it would be as absurd to count merely its numbers as it would be to measure the influence of Paris by the proportion of its population to that of France. It possesses a power which is enormously intensified by concentration. The interest of this great class is clear, definite, and imperative; and in defending it, representatives of the school speak not in the name of a theory, but on behalf of the welfare of millions who depend for their existence on the prosperity of trade. The supreme consideration for them is to obtain the highest amount of employment. For this it is necessary that the cost of production should be as low, and the demand as high, as possible; that is, in order to multiply labour, it must be made as cheap, and the markets for its produce must be as numerous, as possible. By these two considerations, the Manchester party wishes the whole internal and external policy of the empire to be determined. By these they are guided in every question, and are obliged to become politicians in order to prosper as manufacturers. Now thirty years ago this great class of society was not represented in the legislature, and fifteen years ago it was still taxed for the benefit of another class. Reform and the abolition of the Corn-Laws first placed it on an equal footing, and enabled it to develop its interests into a system. In order to compete with foreign industry, it is necessary to be able to produce at less cost. Therefore the food of the workman, and the raw material of the manufacture, must both be cheapened to the utmost; and the reform of the tariff necessarily followed the aboli-

tion of the corn and navigation laws. This is the common notion of free trade, but the school understands the term in a far wider sense. Free trade is a principle which embraces all things, a formula that can be applied to every public question. It is nothing but the principle of free production, of removing every obstacle to cheapness. The condition of their existence is the foundation of their whole philosophy. They can never be at a loss to make their principle harmonise with their interest.

The perpetual competition which has so greatly developed our industry multiplies for the manufacturers the pressure of every financial burden. They are most persevering in their efforts to diminish the expenditure of the State, and the taxation which ensues from it; because, whereas others feel only the loss of the exact sum they pay to the exchequer, every burden on the manufacturers diminishes their powers of competition, and threatens them with the loss of their industrial supremacy. They advocate the voluntary system in religion on principles of free trade and free competition, and oppose establishments as a compulsory imposition on the people. The State exists for the purpose of removing the obstacles to the free development of trade and of the wealth of nations. Religion is beyond its sphere. Indirect taxation is tyrannical because it diminishes consumption; because it is a tax on labour, and raises its cost, which it is the sole function of the State to depress. The only just object of taxation is property, not labour: therefore direct taxation is alone legitimate. Indirect taxation impedes the creation of property; direct taxation promotes it: one is a source of poverty, the other of wealth.

This system of material interests possesses at the same time a species of moral dignity. The manufacturers are interested in the increase of production and consumption, not for their own sake only, but for millions who depend on them. Accordingly they have always been able to decorate their system with many high words; to represent free trade as a principle of social and political liberty, and their private interests as motives of philanthropy. Thus they have

succeeded in disguising the essentially material character of their philosophy. The most plausible of its consequences is the demand for perpetual universal peace. All men as consumers have certain common interests, and trade carries bonds of union to all mankind. "Such," says Lord Overstone, "is the beneficent law of international commercial intercourse; all trading countries have a common interest in the progressive prosperity of their neighbours; and no doubt can be entertained that the effects of a blow which an invasion of England would inflict upon our commercial prosperity must vibrate through the whole trading world." Competition, says Proudhon, implies a common aim. This extension of common interests over many nations is a great sign of the progress of the science of economy. Formerly it was believed, both in the economical and the political spheres, that what is gained by one is lost by another. *Quicquid alicubi adjicitur*, says Bacon, *alibi detrahitur*. The desire for the greatness of our country, says Voltaire, implies a desire for the destruction of our neighbour; it is evident that one country cannot profit unless another loses. But now the competition of trade is regarded no longer as a *bellum omnium contra omnes*. All legitimate interests, says Bastiat, are in harmony with each other. This is the merit of the Manchester doctrine, when they tell us that what remains for us to conquer is, not States with the sword, but markets with our industry. But, in fact, this is a mere question of pounds, shillings, and pence. Standing armies increase the weight of taxation, and fetter the arms of labour; and war interrupts consumption. Accordingly, at the beginning of the Russian war, we were reminded that every shot we fired might destroy a debtor or a customer of England. This is a new extreme, the exaggerated reaction of interest against passion; but also of material against moral motives. These errors are older than the Manchester school. They came in naturally in an age of sophists, economists, and calculators. Thus Say considers all ecclesiastics as useless drones, and calls Napoleon a celebrated madman. Cooper, in his lectures on political economy (1826),

declared that a nation has no real existence, and is nothing but a technical term invented by statesmen, to serve, like logarithms, in certain calculations. The Manchester school are not the first who have seen nothing but the material element in politics, who think more of the goods produced than of the producer or consumer, of the work than of the workman. But they are the first who have carried out as a practical system of policy the preference of the interests of trade over those of any body or any other principle. National peculiarities, and even national jealousies which defend them, are necessary conditions for the progress of mankind; and quarrels may always proceed from the inevitable differences of interest, feeling, or opinion. "Nothing," says a great historian, "contributed more to the Macedonian and the Roman conquests than the cosmopolitanism of the later Greek philosophers."

In reality, the practical result of the principle that the interests of labour are the supreme law, leads to the rejection of every moral influence in politics. The Ten-Hours Bill was opposed as a sort of moral protectionism. The State has no right to interfere in the free contract between the artisan and his employer. Its business is only to prevent all interference and to remove every influence. In protecting moral against material interests, men against goods, the State is powerless. But where it has to act in favour of the producing interest, then it is omnipotent, because the claims of that interest are paramount and imperative. So that freedom is not their object, but their pretext. Their real object justifies the action of the most unmitigated despotism. It is in direct contradiction with their professions. They favour civil liberty only as a means to an end; and they prefer a despotism, if, by the sacrifice of all other rights, those of industry can be secured. Hence the Emperor of the French, who, in

his efforts to strengthen the material foundations of a power which is absolutely destitute of any moral support, has done more for the encouragement of trade and the repression of thought than any foreign prince, is so completely the ideal of the party, that they not only praise him for his economical policy, but affirm, as Mr. Cobden has done, that the French enjoy in full measure the blessings of real freedom.

The purpose of the reform advocated by the Manchester party is not the improvement of the representation, but its destruction. For representation serves to combine all particular interests in the paramount interest and policy of the State. But our Radical reformers desire the absolute predominance of one interest, the subservience of the State to it. This is the policy of which an absolute monarch can be the guardian and instrument as well as an assembly, and with which a real representative body cannot coexist.

None have more to gain than Catholics from the partial success of this school in carrying out yet farther its views. None have so much to lose by its complete triumph. The specious theories which are used with such success against our adversaries will be turned with more fatal consequences against ourselves; and we shall find that we are assailed, not only in the outer material interests of the Church, but by the systematic destruction of every moral sentiment, of every higher motive, of every god-like trace in the soul of man. We shall find ourselves compelled to make the bitter choice between temporal rights and spiritual advantage, between this world and the next; and we shall find that we are the fiercest and the most powerful antagonists of a party which has at one period been our greatest benefactor, but with whom we have never had one single positive principle in common.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

*The Revolution in Italy.*

The Revolution has taken one further step in its advance towards the unity of Italy. In our last number we had to relate the annexation of Central Italy to Piedmont by the vote of the people. In proceeding to take possession of his new dominions, Victor Emmanuel was received at Florence by demonstrations of enthusiasm, among which the exhibition of the veiled standards of Naples, Rome, and Venetia, indicated that a part only of the work was done, and announced to the remaining Italian powers that they would soon find themselves attacked. The attack accordingly commenced at the weakest point.

In the month of March an insurrection broke out in Sicily, commencing in Palermo. Its immediate leaders were among the discontented nobles who were in opposition to the government since 1848. There can be no doubt that for internal reasons alone an insurrection was to be expected, whenever the state of Italian affairs gave a fair prospect of success. That prospect was now given by the weakness of Austria, and by the promise of aid from Piedmont, if not from France.

In 1829, on April 16th, the most famous royalist of the Restoration, Chateaubriand, then ambassador at Rome, spoke as follows of the government of Naples in a despatch to the Minister of Foreign Affairs: "It is too true that the government of the Two Sicilies has fallen to the last degree of contempt. . . . They take for conspiracies what is only the general discomfort, the product of the age, the conflict of the old society with the new, of the old and decrepid institutions with the energy of the younger generation. . . . A frontier custom-house can no longer separate liberty from bondage. A man cannot be hanged on one side of a brook for principles which on the other side are deemed sacred." In the following year the late King Ferdinand succeeded, and was admonished by Louis Philippe of the necessity of a constitution. "Freedom," he replied, "is fatal to the House of Bourbon, and for my part I am re-

solved to avoid at any price the fate of Louis XVI. and Charles X. My people obeys force, and submits. . . . With God's help, I will give it prosperity, and the just administration to which it has a right. . . . My people has no need to think; I shall take care of its well-being and of its dignity." He reigned accordingly by the protection of material interests. There were 1506 miles of roads in his dominions at his accession; he added 4500 miles. His labours for the improvement of harbours, for reclaiming land, &c., were most extensive. The example of the Emperor Nicholas was always before him. But in proscribing thought, and considering only material existence as essential to a people, while the moral sphere is full of danger to the State and to religion, he estranged from himself all who aimed higher either for good or for ill. The people generally were sufficiently degraded to be content with such a system. Those who live by their daily labour are seldom moved by any considerations but those which regard their means of subsistence. These being amply provided for, they had not leisure to attend to other things. There is hardly any middle class. The oppressive character of the system was therefore felt chiefly by the educated classes—the nobility and the Church. The former were the principal enemies of the government; the latter, its principal victim. There is no more perfect test of the character of a government than its position towards the Church. A Protestant State may exclude her, or persecute her on religious grounds; but the modifications of her relation to a Catholic state depend entirely upon political considerations. Politically it is no reproach to a Catholic country that it refuses to give perfect equality to a Protestant minority, or to a Protestant country that it denies equal rights to a minority of Catholics. Civil disabilities on religious grounds are not only consistent with the true notion of government, but essential to it, provided they are founded on a very great inequality of numbers. In Spain, for instance, and in Sweden, certain restrictions have been founded

on reasons both of religious feeling and of political expediency. It would be absurd to deny that, where religious unity subsists, its maintenance is a matter both of religious duty and of public advantage. Religious liberty is not a principle of politics, but a political remedy for the evils with which religious differences menace the State. The exclusion of a religion is, however, a very different matter from its repression. We cannot put on the same level the Swedish laws against Catholics with the proceedings of the Swiss Protestants at the time of the Sonderbund, or the severities of the Inquisition with those by which the Emperor Nicholas effected a great apostasy in Lithuania. In a country wholly Catholic or wholly Protestant religious intolerance is not necessarily incompatible with civil liberty. Where different religions subsist together in one State, religious intolerance implies political tyranny. But when in a purely Catholic country the Church is deprived of her independence, it is the surest and strongest sign that can be given of a false theory of government. For the only system which is absolutely contrary to the freedom of the Church, and necessarily at war with her, is the system of arbitrary power. The freedom of the Church in Catholic States can only be asserted in conjunction with other liberties, and is obnoxious only to a policy which endangers in like manner every species of political independence. For this reason it is much better for Catholics to suffer injustice from a Protestant than from a Catholic government; for in the one they may be free at least in other respects, in the other they suffer from a whole system of oppression. Besides, the sufferings endured from heretics or infidels have not the corrupting influence which is exercised by the jealous protection of Catholic sovereigns. This poisonous effect of Catholic despotism has nowhere been more fatal to religion than at Naples, and there is no revolution conceivable in Europe by which religion is less likely to be ultimately a sufferer than a revolution directed against the Neapolitan crown. The Church has less to fear from the revolution than from the despotism that preceded it. This is not, however, an

argument which can be allowed to weigh in determining the lawfulness and justice of the revolution itself. It is on totally different grounds that the events that have occurred must be judged. But we desired to show that there is no occasion to allow any sympathy for the government to interfere with the question of right and wrong.

A gulf far wider than the Straits of Messina separates the Two Sicilies. Their history is quite distinct. The Island of Sicily belonged, from the peace of Utrecht till 1734, to the House of Savoy. When the French occupied Naples, it never fell into their hands, and being under British protection, became for a time almost a dependency of Great Britain. After the war of 1809, it was expected that Murat would invade the island, and the court looked to England for defence. During this period King Ferdinand violated the ancient Sicilian constitution by arbitrarily imposing new taxes; and when the Estates protested, five of the leading barons were arrested and thrown into prison. In consequence of this dispute, the English government directed their minister at Palermo, Lord William Bentinck, to effect a military occupation of the country. A reform of the old constitution was resolved on, and the king abdicated provisionally in favour of his son. Bentinck reorganised the Sicilian army, and in the course of nine months 7000 Sicilian troops were detached to join our armies in Spain. At the same time the mediæval constitution of the country was reformed in imitation of England. The old king disliked and resisted these changes. He resumed his authority, and when, at the Restoration, he recovered his dominions on the continent, he published a manifesto of the most liberal description (1st May 1815): "A firm, wise, and religious government is secured to you. The people will be sovereign (*il popolo sarà sovrano*), and the prince will be the depositary of the laws, and will frame the most energetic and the most desirable of constitutions." Nevertheless the parliament of Sicily was ignored, the new institutions were rejected as unsuited to the nation, and the old as unsuited to the times. At Naples the king

found all things arranged by the French upon the principles of modern absolutism, which possessed such a fatal attraction for the restored princes throughout Europe. He resolved to assimilate the two portions of his kingdom, and to govern Sicily by the same convenient system of uniformity and centralisation which he found prepared for him at Naples.

June 21, 1821. Lord William Bentinck, supported by Sir James Mackintosh, brought these events before the consideration of the House of Commons. So far, he said, from the stipulations of the English ministers having been fulfilled, after the evacuation of Sicily by the English army, there never was a more complete annihilation of all rights and privileges than that which followed.

... Great merit was attached to the king for having agreed to the abolition of the feudal system. His view, in reality, was to get rid of the only check that existed against the unlimited power of the Crown. It was, however, urged by Lord Castle-reagh, in reply, that there never was a constitution less suited to the genius of a people, or less likely to work beneficially for them, than that which had been formed in imitation of the English; and it was generally felt, when the English troops left the island, that the constitution could not stand. This was hardly an exaggeration; but it was no defence of the policy of the Neapolitan government in abolishing the new constitution without restoring the old.

When the Carbonari were in power at Naples, in 1820, the Sicilians likewise rose up in arms, and demanded the restoration of their national rights. But the Italian liberals, then as now, were more intent upon increasing the central power in the State, whilst it was in their hands, than on promoting local independence. They sent troops to quell the insurrection, and to preserve the legislative and administrative union. Palermo capitulated, on condition that the question of the union should be submitted to a Sicilian parliament; but the Neapolitan parliament refused to ratify the capitulation. This shows the vast difference which has hitherto subsisted between the Sicilian movement and the Italian revolution.

The old Sicilian constitution had grown up gradually, like that of England, from the Norman conquest. It had maintained itself, with its aristocratic character unaltered, through all the troubles and revolutions of the Continent. Even under the dominion of Spain it continued to be respected; and whilst other European dependencies of the Spanish crown suffered an intolerable oppression, in Sicily the conquerors and the natives lived in harmony together. The French revolution itself left no traces there, and the revolutionary changes were only introduced at the restoration on behalf of the royal power. So that, whilst the Italians were incited by the revolutionary ideas to attack the legitimate thrones, the Sicilians were protesting against the revolutionary policy of the legitimate government, and appealing to their ancient laws, which had been respected by many dynasties of kings. The Sicilian revolution of 1848 was the protest of a nation, headed by its natural leaders, in favour of its laws; it was the act of the clergy and of the aristocracy, not of a party. For this reason it was less violent and less energetic than the movement in the rest of Italy. It did not invoke the passions of the people. It was more spontaneous and less prepared—a popular rising, not a conspiracy—a protest against definite grievances, not a pursuit of speculative ends. It broke out quite independently of the movement on the mainland, and preceded it by many weeks. It followed the reforms of Pius IX., not the revolution of February; and its rallying cry was, "Long live Pius IX. and the Constitution." The chiefs of the Italian revolution vehemently denounced a movement so different in its origin and its ends from their own. Garibaldi was solicited by the Sicilians to command them, and he refused. Their insurrection had none of the characteristics of the Italian; they did not desire the unity of Italy, and they had no republican sympathies. When the deposition of the House of Bourbon was voted, the immediate question was, whether the crown should be offered to a prince of the House of Lorraine or of the House of Savoy. In Sicily, as in Naples, there is no middle class, and

the common people took little interest in what was done. They were generally excluded from the elections by the law, which restricted the franchise to those who could read and write; and it was difficult therefore to raise an army. The attempt which failed twelve years ago has now been renewed, this time with complete success. The higher classes and the clergy have taken part as before, the people have fought with fury, and foreign aid has decided the victory.

A government so degrading as that of Naples would have explained an insurrection in any civilised community, but it would not have served as a legal justification of it. The government of Sicily was manifestly unjust and revolutionary, as well as oppressive. Suffering and discontent do not give a people the right to revolt, because prosperity and happiness are not things which it has an absolute right to claim of its rulers, or which a government is necessarily able to provide. The State is an institution by which public and private rights are to be maintained, and wrong punished. Two theories have been popular in modern times which denied that duty—the theory of absolute monarchy, and the theory of the sovereignty of the people. According to both, the sovereign, whether the monarch or the people, can do no wrong. In both systems, therefore, passive obedience is a duty. Both are to a certain degree idolatrous; and altogether revolutionary, for they set up might in place of right, and substitute a new system of ordinances, a new fountain of authority in the place of the commandments of God. Both deny the existence of a higher law, and elevate the public authority over the individual conscience. It is hard for the Christian notion of government to maintain itself between these impious systems. It teaches that all authority is sacred, inasmuch as it comes from God. The absolutists say that the royal authority is alone divine; the democrats, that only the collective authority of the people is divine. But a State is not simply the antithesis of sovereignty and subjection. It is a complex system of authorities and services. Now we hold that all power, not all sovereignty only, is from God. The paternal authority, the eccle-

siastical authority, every natural local authority, all equally enjoy the divine sanction. Each is in its sphere supreme, and each is a limit to the sovereign power. An assault upon any such authority is criminal and revolutionary, whether it proceed from its subjects, or from another authority. The power of the State is supreme only in its own sphere, like that of the family, the municipality, the Church, the parliament. All these powers are protected by the State, none can be controlled by it. It is their right and their duty to restrain its action within its own definite limits. It is out of these several partial authorities that the State has grown. Where they subsist, law and right can prevail, because there are organs to maintain it. When they disappear before a levelling absolutism, a revolutionary condition ensues, in which might alone prevails, and in which might alone can be appealed to. A nation so governed is not really a State, and the laws of political rights and duties do not apply to it. It is a system of arbitrary power, restrained by violence—a system in which laws are silent.

If, therefore, the sovereign power is bound by the same law as every other authority, it is subject to the same responsibility. But the sovereign in defending his rights commands the power of the State. The other authorities possess only the forces of society. One is organised, the other is not. Therefore the defence of legitimate rights, when not undertaken by the supreme power, bears necessarily a violent character. An established order must be overthrown when it is resisted on behalf of an established right. Self-government is the end of all government, and implies the right of self-defence. The theory of passive obedience is as entirely revolutionary as the theory of the sovereignty of the people, whilst the Christian theory admits the divine right of princes, and not of princes only, but of every other organised authority, down to that of the husband and the father. That this view of the character of the State is inconsistent with absolute government, is nowhere so well understood as by the absolutists themselves. They have, therefore, endeavoured to



break down all those kindred and coeval powers whose rights are independent of the State. As, however, an abstract authority is powerless without the instrumentality of concrete authorities, the system of absolutism has replaced the local powers by agents deriving their authority from the State. Bureaucratic centralisation took the place of self-government, and the State instead of an organism became a machine. Countries in which this unnatural system has prevailed are exposed to continual revolutions. It is inconsistent with freedom, and therefore with the natural political development. In a country like Sicily, the question is whether a wrong has been committed. If it has, the right is with those who seek to redress the wrong.

It became evident by the end of April that the Sicilians could not drive the Neapolitans from the island if unassisted by a foreign force, or by a diversion in Naples itself. Of the latter there was no probability. The disbanded regiments of Swiss had been immediately replaced by a foreign legion, the whole army was on a war footing, and the kingdom was separated from revolutionary Italy by a barrier which promised effectual resistance.

Lamoricière had taken the command of the diminished army of Rome, and Monsignor de Mérode, who had served under his orders in Africa, was minister of war. The great visible defender of the temporal power of the Holy See could no longer be relied on. The dominion of the Austrians in Milan and Florence, on which the sovereignty of the four last Popes ostensibly depended, was broken, and the Romagna was already lost. Then the question arose, whether, in the absence of the power with whose cause that of the Papacy appeared to be identified, the voluntary efforts of the Catholics generally could not effectually replace it; whether in reality it was true that the Pope's temporal crown must stand or fall with the hegemony of Austria in Italy. A cry of enthusiasm rang through the Catholic world. It found its first and loudest echo among those who were friends of the Pope without being friends of the Austrians. The Catholics of France were foremost in

their protest, and in the writings of Dupanloup, Lacordaire, Sauzet, Montalembert, the feeling conspicuously displays itself, that the cause of the Papacy must be separated from that of foreign domination; that national independence is as sacred and as just as personal liberty; that the Pope may be a temporal sovereign even in a united Italy. The sympathy so warmly shown by the French found better and more active instruments elsewhere. A general collection was made for the Pope, and it included many a splendid offering and many a widow's mite. Offerings more generous and more valuable than presents of gold soon followed. Thousands of volunteers poured in from Austria and Ireland, faster than they could be armed and organised. Before the end of May, Lamoricière was at the head of 18,000 well-disciplined troops, concentrated near the frontier, between Rome and Ancona, and able to defy any movement proceeding from the free corps alone. The prestige of a great commander in southern Italy threatened the plans of Sardinia with discomfiture. Their execution was hastened. Early in May, it was announced that Garibaldi was preparing an expedition to Sicily. The Neapolitan government applied to England to prevent it. Lord John Russell wrote to Turin to protest against the expedition being permitted to depart, and to Naples to protest against the policy of the king; and he announced to the House of Commons, that the latter protest, by which he dealt a heavy blow to the position of the Neapolitan government, was justified and counterbalanced by the great service he had rendered by preventing the departure of Garibaldi.

May 7. Garibaldi embarked at night with about 1200 men in the neighbourhood of Genoa, on board two vessels. The garrison of Genoa was confined to barracks, in order to prevent the soldiers enlisting in large numbers in the expedition. Having thus fulfilled their engagement with England, and facilitated on land the preparations of departure, the Piedmontese government sent out a ship of war to intercept Garibaldi. At the same time they explained to the Powers that he was too popular and influential a person in the coun-

try for an administration so enfeebled as that of Count Cavour by the disaffection in Tuscany, and by the cession of Nice and Savoy, to take energetic steps to stop his undertaking. It is evident that the conduct that they pursued was dictated by distinct motives of policy. If while Lamoricière consolidated the pontifical throne the Neapolitans should succeed in quelling the Sicilian insurrection, a reaction would necessarily commence from the South, which would convert into open rebellion the doubtful allegiance of the Tuscans, whilst the government at home was shaken by the violent opposition of the advanced patriotic party. The march of events loudly called for a diversion in Sicily.

*May 11.* Garibaldi landed at Marsala, without loss, in the presence of Neapolitan and English men-of-war. The former might have prevented the landing, but were disconcerted by the presence of the British. After two successful actions, the insurgents, aided by Garibaldi, appeared on the eleventh day after the landing on the heights before Palermo. The garrison consisted of 20,000 men; but the city was now no longer quiet. A large body of troops could not be sent out without great danger. For Palermo has near 200,000 inhabitants, and was restrained only by martial law, proclaimed 16th May. Two regiments refused to fire, and were sent to Naples. Even the police began to desert. After the fighting began, some ships with Swiss soldiers arrived in the harbour, and the soldiers were not landed. Meantime Garibaldi received new reinforcements from Genoa and Leghorn, and Sardinian ships were busy at night landing stores and ammunition along the coast.

*May 27.* Garibaldi forced his way into Palermo. The whole city rose in arms at his appearance. The royal troops retired into the forts and bombarded the place. An armistice was concluded, and the Neapolitan general offered to capitulate. The king appealed to the great Powers in vain that the integrity of his dominions might be guaranteed. England refused to mediate, but used her influence to prevent Sardinia from fomenting disturbances on the mainland. The king then ratified the ca-

pitulation of the garrison of Palermo, and on the 9th June the evacuation commenced. A force of near 9000 men still holds Messina.

Garibaldi proceeded to take possession of Sicily in the name of Victor Emmanuel, and to organise a provisional government. It is extremely doubtful whether the Sicilians will bear the Piedmontese government beyond the moment when it is necessary to enable them to expel the Neapolitans from Messina. So far the clergy has taken no part against Garibaldi. Now, as in 1848, they are for separation. But at this very moment the open conflict has begun between the government of Turin and the clergy of the annexed provinces. The Cardinal Archbishop of Pisa, the Bishops of Imola and Faenza, the vicar occupying at Bologna the place of the famous Cardinal Viale, who died on the 15th of May, the chapter of Piacenza, and other dignitaries have been arrested, because they acted in obedience to the decree of excommunication. That at the same time a good understanding should subsist between Garibaldi, whose watchword was "Death to the priests," and the Sicilian clergy, proves how terribly political excitement outstrips the religious feeling of the Italians, and how much the hatred of the Church depends upon her political position.

France has taken no prominent part in these events. The French troops have been busy evacuating Lombardy and occupying Savoy. Meantime the government claims the sanction of a European conference for the annexation, and sends forth semi-official pamphlets to prepare the way for an attack on Prussia and an attack on England, as it formerly announced the war with Austria and with the Pope. They are all dictated by the same policy, and are parts of the same design, which sent Garibaldi to Sicily, and promises to lead the combined forces of France and of a united Italy against the German powers and their allies.

*June 15.* The Emperor Napoleon arrived at Baden to meet the Prince Regent of Prussia, the four German kings, and many of the reigning princes. He was badly received by the people in Germany, and elicited from the assembled princes a demonstration of unity which was not be-

lieved to exist, and from the Regent the announcement of an understanding with Austria which was not expected.

### *Spain.*

The last few months form an important epoch in the history of constitutional Spain. A popular foreign war has been carried to a successful termination, a Carlist insurrection has been subdued without difficulty or effort, and the Carlist princes have renounced their pretensions to the crown. Whilst the throne of Queen Isabella seems thus secured for the future, the kingdom has entered upon a new period of prosperity and development, of which we take this opportunity of giving some instances.

The fall of Tetuan did not decide the fate of the Morocco war, for it induced the Spanish commander to raise his demands, and thus led the war party in Morocco to insist on a prolonged resistance. The regular army had not been engaged, and the duty of resisting the Spaniards had fallen, for the most part, on the inhabitants of the province through which they passed. In order to satisfy this party, a renewal of the conflict was required, and Muley Abbas resolved to give battle once more for the defence of Tangier, before accepting the Spanish conditions of peace. March 23d, O'Donnell set out from Tetuan on his road to Tangier, and was attacked the same day by the Moors. As in every action of the war, the victory remained with the Spaniards, though with a loss of 1700 men. Next day the Moors determined to treat.

Whilst the Spanish army was engaged in Africa, the governor of the Balearic Islands, General Ortega, landed with his troops in Spain, and proclaimed Don Carlos. He was deserted by his men, taken prisoner, and shot with several others. The Carlists had long conspired to take advantage of the difficult situation of O'Donnell to attempt a new rising. Ortega had been to Paris to prepare it, and Count Montemolin arrived there from Naples, intending to put himself at the head of the movement. His wish was to wait for O'Donnell's return, when it was expected that the conditions of peace would make him unpopular. It was clear that if the war was deemed successful, and

he could reap the fruits of his success, the Carlists lost their chance for good, for Queen Isabella's throne had not yet been strengthened by the glory of a military success abroad. Ortega induced his chief to consent to his wish to make the attempt in the absence of O'Donnell with the army in Africa. This resolution was suddenly adopted after the Carlist leaders, Cabrera and Elio, had returned to London, with the understanding that the affair would be postponed. Their friends in Spain were not prepared for this sudden change of plan, and so nothing was ready, and the power of O'Donnell was consolidated. April 21st, Count Montemolin (Don Carlos) and his brother Don Fernando were arrested near Tortosa.

*May 2.* An act of renunciation of his claims to the crown of Spain was signed by Count Montemolin, in his prison. It contained, however, no express recognition of the rights of the Queen. The Spanish pretender had been kept in strict confinement, without any communication with his friends. He consented to sign the document, which was drawn up for him, in order to save the lives of Elio and others of his party who were taken. But it was stipulated that the act should be valid only when it had been ratified by him after his liberation, and after he had quitted Spain. He was, however, no sooner at liberty than the Carlists protested against his resignation, denied his right to give it, and denied also the authenticity of the act. The second brother of Count Montemolin, Don Juan de Borbon, had opposed the design of Ortega, but when he heard that it was resolved on, left England to take part in it. Before he had reached Spain, however, Ortega was taken, and he returned home. Here he published a manifesto to the Cortes, protesting against the act by which his brother Don Carlos had abandoned the rights of his family, and declaring that he meant to uphold them, although he hoped for his restoration only by peaceful means, and the return of the Spanish people to the principle of legitimacy, not by arms or bloodshed.

A general amnesty was proclaimed in Spain, to all who would consent to swear allegiance to the Queen. It

was intended as a proof to the world how little the Carlist party was feared, and how complete its discomfiture was believed to be. In confirmation of this view, the Queen's speech to the Cortes, 25th May, contained no allusion to the abdication of Don Carlos, and the Cortes determined not to consider the letter of Don Juan. But O'Donnell firmly refused to abrogate the decree by which the younger branch of the royal family are banished from Spain, and declared that it would be followed by great danger to the throne and the dynasty.

The claims of the Carlist party were founded on the most exaggerated view of legitimacy, which treats public as a part of private law, and makes the national law of the Spaniards and their practice for centuries subservient to the habits of the foreign dynasty who reigned over them. No principle of right is involved in their cause, and it is hard to feel any personal sympathy for their pretenders. But the Christino party has exhibited all the evil qualities of modern liberalism, and is distinctly opposed to the old Spanish character, and to all that is valuable in the institutions of old Spain. For some years after the defeat of Cabrera, in 1839, there seemed little prospect of a permanent settlement, and the country was distracted by the animosities of Moderados and Progressistas as much as it had been by the antagonism of Christinos and Carlists. The peace brought no remedy for the calamities of war. It will be enough if we quote the opinion which was held by the greatest Spaniard of our time on his country about ten years ago: "The most corrupting and the most corrupt person in our society is the middle class, whose representatives we are. Do you not see that it has all its cries and applause for those who have the power in their hands? . . . Idolatry seems to be the natural religion of all multitudes, especially of those that have been corrupted by revolutions. . . . Not only are the sentiments corrupt, but the ideas also are perverted; and I think I may affirm that at no period of our history has the level of intellect been lower amongst us. . . . Our country is lost, utterly lost, irrecoverably lost. The moderate party,

that has preserved order till now, seems to me definitely exhausted and carried away in the general movement of dissolution. . . . Spain has arrived at the period of the last years of Louis Philippe, and is on the eve of the catastrophe of February" (*Donoso Cortes, Works*, i. 416, 420; ii. 149, 162).

About the same time a celebrated French economist, Blanqui, travelled in Spain, and wrote as follows: "The barracks have taken the place of the monasteries, the soldier has supplanted the monk, but nobody has thought of the labourer and producer. Those who formerly lived on the alms of the religious bodies now live upon the salaries of the State. There is no more aristocracy, and no more clergy, and there is not yet a third estate." In 1850 the pension-list amounted to 136,000,000 reals, in 1854 to 162,000,000. Every civil office has several nominal occupants, creatures of successive ministries, of Narvaez, Espartero, or O'Donnell, who receive half-pay. In like manner each division has several generals, every regiment four or five colonels. O'Donnell himself appointed in the course of a few months fifty-eight brigadiers, 142 majors, and 238 captains, to strengthen his party.

In the twenty-five years of the constitutional life of Spain, there have been 47 presidents of the council of ministers, and 529 ministers. This parliamentary anarchy appears now to be at an end, and the present is the first powerful administration that has subsisted of late. Its strength is in the energy and good fortune of its chief, and in the exhaustion of the old parties. The termination of the long dispute with Rome promises a happier period for the Spanish Church; and in all material departments extraordinary progress has been lately made. "It is my conviction," wrote Blanqui in 1850, "that Spain has a future before her, if not more brilliant, at least more solid, than the past of which she is so proud. People think her an exhausted and worn-out country, whereas she is only badly governed."

In the year 1846 the population of Spain was hardly 12,000,000; it now exceeds 16,000,000. In 1855 the annual mortality was 1 in 33; it is now 1 in 38. In 1768 the number of the

clergy was 210,000; it is now 44,000. All the religious orders of men have disappeared. The whole property of the clergy, which has been confiscated by the State, amounted to 24,000,000*l*. By the convention of 25th August 1859, the Church has, however, the right of acquiring property without any limitation, and independently of the annual payment guaranteed to the clergy from the State. Of the whole territory of Spain, fourteen per cent is not at present under cultivation. Even now the produce of agriculture is almost double the consumption, and the quantity of wine annually exported is nearly half the whole produce. The agricultural exports in 1858 amounted to 10,000,000*l*. In 1850 the whole imports were 671,993,640 reals, and the exports 488,690,949. In 1857 the former had increased to 1,555,375,013 reals, the latter to 1,168,584,599. The number of Spanish vessels entering the ports in 1850 were 2567; in 1857, 4719: leaving them in 1850, 2198; in 1857, 4483. Foreign vessels entered in 1850, 1911; in 1857, 4944: left in 1850, 2072; in 1857, 3292. The tonnage of the former was, in 1850, 303,742 tons; in 1857, 429,659. Of the latter, in 1850, 270,232; in 1857, 790,333. The number of schools has increased since 1855 by 3500. There are still not enough for half the number of children requiring education.

It is clear that after a long probation the Church is fast recovering a most salutary influence upon the people, such as she did not possess in the time of her greatest prosperity and wealth. For the influence she will now enjoy will belong to herself alone, and will be founded on nothing but the religious faith of the people. Formerly it was derived in part from her property, in part from the help of the State, and was exercised in great part for the service of the State. "God," says Donoso Cortes, "has made nations curable; but it is not intrigues, but principles, that have the divine virtue of healing them."

#### *Emancipation of the Serfs in Russia.*

It is difficult to compress within the limits of our monthly chronicle any intelligible notice of the efforts of the Russian government to accom-

plish a revolution more vast than those to which the attention of western Europe is confined, or than that question of abolition upon which the political interests of America depend. Its progress can be understood only by grouping together the facts and events of a considerable period; for the movement is slow and silent, and if we wait for the crisis itself we may wait in vain.

All nations have passed through the stage of slavery on their way to civilisation, and the process now going on in Russia has occurred, under many varieties of circumstances, every where else. For liberty is a plant of slow growth and late maturity, and belongs only to nations that have reached their prime and have not approached decay. An institution so universal and apparently inevitable cannot be treated as simply an evil or a wrong, and it is as vain to rail against it absolutely as to complain that children cannot take care of themselves. Helplessness or childishness is contemptible only in a grown-up man, and slavery is criminal only when it is artificial. At one period of society it is natural and beneficial. It marks in the history of civilisation the first step out of savage life. Savages of the lowest stage, who have neither fixed nor movable property, neither house nor land, hunters, like the North American Indians, give no quarter in battle, or spare their prisoners only to torture them. An Indian cannot keep his captive, for he cannot make him useful in his mode of life. The moment a prisoner is armed, like his master, he is virtually free. If weapons are denied him, the master himself must toil to support him. These savages have neither wealth nor humanity enough to adopt the institution of slavery, and in the absence of that resource their women are degraded practically to the condition of slaves; whilst, therefore, at one period of civilised life slavery is the most unnatural and oppressive evil, at another period it is a blessing and an improvement.

It arises as soon as a people begins to have fixed settlements and to till the soil. Land is then the only kind of property; those who have none depend for their existence on those that have. The only equivalent they

can give is their labour; and in order that their children may be fed, their bondage becomes hereditary. The bondsman cultivates the soil; the owner is able to attend to higher concerns, his wife and children enjoy equality and freedom, and a great step onwards has been taken in the growth of civilisation. Slavery is the beginning of the division of labour, and the first shape in which it appears. Nor is it in those early stages felt as oppressive; for abuse is rare, as the master has hardly any protection against the revenge of his slaves; and it is only when we have the consciousness of freedom that we can perceive that we do not possess it. Discontent begins later on, when servitude ceases to be natural; and then severity on one side makes up for willingness on the other. Then theories of liberty and religion begin to be invoked, and people argue like the abolitionists in America, that slavery is wrong, and unchristian in principle. In the Church this was not thought of until the ninth century, when a new theory began to be formed, to suit an altered state of things. As wants increase, as labour becomes more remunerative and the population more dense, slavery becomes less advantageous. Slave-labour is naturally unproductive, and totally unfit for the higher kinds of industry. Haxthausen says, that serfs are seldom employed in the factories of their own masters. They are sent out to find work for themselves, paying a tax (*obrok*) to their landlord, who finds the paid labour of the serfs of other masters more profitable than the cheaper labour of his own. The introduction of beasts of burden raised the slave one step; capital and machinery made him useless altogether. If the shuttle, says Aristotle, could weave, and the lyre play, of itself, then neither would the architect want servants nor the master slaves (*Politics*, i. 4). Tucker calculates, that the point at which the interest of the owner leads to emancipation depends on the density of the population. Where there are sixty-six inhabitants per square mile, he considers that slavery ceases to be a good speculation. In England, the abolition of serfdom began when the population was about forty persquare mile, and was concluded when it was

ninety-two. In Russia, it is only twenty-five; but from the enormous spaces that are not inhabited, it is very unequal. In this lies one great difficulty of emancipation. The same measure has to be applied simultaneously to districts differing widely in their economical condition and interests, and at various stages of political development. In no other European country has serfdom possessed a character so oppressive as in Russia, yet it has almost everywhere required violent political convulsions to prepare its abolition. In France, emancipation was the work of the revolution of 1789; in Prussia, of the catastrophe of 1806; in Austria, of the revolution of 1848. Where there has not been an energetic and persistent pressure, it has generally failed. In Russia, this pressure has been supplied chiefly by the Crimean war. Russian serfdom is the last remnant of servitude in Christian Europe, and it is the most recent in its origin.

Like all nomad tribes, the Slavonians at their first settlement in Europe were personally free. The larger proprietors endeavoured, in the natural course of things when agriculture begins, to render those of less property dependent on themselves. It has been said that the first reaction against this tendency of the wealthier class was the adoption of Christianity, and *Krestiane* is still the appellation of the country people in distinction from the inhabitants of towns. Under the innumerable petty princes of the dynasty of Rurik, the village community was the proprietor of the land, and the individual members were free. They paid collectively tribute to the nobles, who had no claim upon the individuals severally, and who were precluded from any excess of authority by the right which the people enjoyed of free emigration. This latter right was the great drawback on the power of the nobility, and made the people quite independent of them, whilst it in no way affected the interests of the sovereign, as it did not extend beyond his dominions. The right was very commonly put in practice, as it was the means by which the people prevented the growth of the authority of the landlords. The unity of power, which the Czars obtained in the wars for national independence, was based

on the attachment of the free peasantry, who saw in the sovereign their protector against the nobles and against the Tartars. The monarchical power developed itself both against the foreign invaders and against the aristocracy. The interests of the common people were carefully respected. The last Czars of the house of Rurik, especially Ivan the Terrible, were the most sanguinary tyrants that history records. But their violence and cruelty were directed against the aristocracy, who limited and divided their power, never against the people, who were its instruments; and Ivan lives in popular tradition like our own bluff King Hal, as a jolly good-natured prince, a comic, not an awful figure. And in his time the lot of the Russian peasant was not oppressive. But when the last of the descendants of Rurik died, an aristocratic reaction ensued, and the boyars raised one of themselves to the throne. The first act of the triumphant aristocracy was to abolish that right of migration which was the great barrier to their power, and the great security of the freedom of the people. On St. George's Day, 1602, every peasant was attached inseparably to the spot which he inhabited at the moment. They became *gleba adscripti*, the mildest form of bondage, and in the existing state of society a necessary condition to give value to the land by securing its cultivation. This reaction of the Russian boyars is not unexampled in other places. In Bohemia, serfdom had completely disappeared by the fourteenth century, when the preponderance of the nobles under Ladislas II. led to its restoration. In Hungary, it began to be abolished early in the twelfth century, but in the year 1351 the right of migration was taken away.

The law of Boris made the peasantry entirely dependent on the landlord, without any resource against oppression. Yet their personal liberty was nominally acknowledged, and the village continued to enjoy the property of its own lands. They formed a system of tributary communities, seldom molested by the nobles. Their constitution is the great peculiarity of Russian life, and explains the patience with which the people have borne a grievous tyr-

anny. The notion of personal rights and freedom develops itself even with the progress of civilisation. In the lower stages the individual is very little considered; he acts only in a collective capacity; the State deals with groups and corporations. For as the State performs very few of the services required for the existence of society, society is then obliged to provide its own organs for the purpose, in its orders, communities, corporations, and other natural associations. The supreme power is designed to do little more than to preserve the nation from external danger, consequently the sovereign is usually only the most powerful member of the community, as the most suited to perform that function; otherwise he has little authority, and does not interfere in internal concerns. It is hard to say whether the local communities are parts of the State, or whether the State is an alliance of separate communities. But as it has little power, and little to perform, the corporations which supply its place naturally possess great authority over individuals. This is the character of mediæval society. It is a consequence of this that the body which performs such important functions makes corresponding claims. The chief of these is the ownership of the land. The immediate owner has only the enjoyment of it, the *dominium utile*. At his death his estate lapses to the community. When a nomad tribe adopts fixed settlements, each individual has equal claims with the others, and as the flocks were common property, the land is held in common, and each man receives his allotment. The Anglo-Saxons called this system Folkland, and it survived to the present century in the North of England, under the name of partnership tenure. It may subsist until the sense of personal rights and duties—which all the Slavonic races imperfectly possess—is developed by cultivation, wealth, and the division of labour, and whilst there is a superfluity of uncultivated land. In both respects Russia still remains at this stage of progress; and the system appears so naturally suited to the country, independently of all internal reasons for preferring it, that even the German colonists in

Saratow wished to organise themselves in this way. In this institution many Russian patriots place their hopes of the political regeneration of the country. It contains an element of local self-government, for its affairs are administered by a chief elected by a council of elders, who control his action and share his authority, and have even the power of deposing him. But in this system the idea of personal liberty does not exist, and cannot even be admitted without destroying the whole fabric of communism. It has encouraged tyranny rather than checked it by making it easier to bear, and by destroying the self-dependence of the people who are accustomed to rely upon the community for every thing; and it has been the lever by which the crown has broken the only power which could restrain its own, that of the nobility. It is the means by which the nobles have found it possible to make serfs of the peasants, and by which they have themselves been made dependent.

The system of communism is in fact as injurious economically as it is politically, and whilst it subsists the financial purpose of the emancipation cannot be attained. It injures agriculture as much as servitude can do; for whilst the land of the nobles is badly cultivated, because the labour of a serf is less valuable than that of paid free labourers, the village lands are badly tilled because no man feels a personal interest in the improvement of his allotted portion, with which no hopes and no memories are connected, which does not represent to him the accumulation of the labour of his fathers, and which will not secure the results of his own toil to his descendants. Personal freedom is impossible without personal property. Servitude was required in order to attach the peasant to the soil, because his social communism detached him from it. If the first is removed, he will have no inducement to remain in his own village, to which the feeling of home fails to bind him. The nomad propensity which was the bane of old Russia will be revived, and the land, in which the undeveloped resources of the empire chiefly lie, will be less productive than before.

When the peasant was bound ir-

revocably to the glebe, he had no means of escaping from the tyranny of the nobles, and no means of restraining it. On this foundation, therefore, a superstructure of unmitigated servitude was arbitrarily raised. The nobles used their obligation of levying troops and money for the crown to reduce the peasants to personal bondage, and gradually to assume the right of disposing of the common land. Of this irregular and abnormal state of things Peter the Great took advantage to make them entirely responsible for the people, whilst he deprived them of their political privileges. The territorial aristocracy was transformed into an official hierarchy, but they obtained unlimited power over the peasants, and at the same time, the whole responsibility of their existence. The ukase of 1723 bound the serf to the person of his owner in addition to his bondage to the soil. But it now was in the power of the landlord to release him from his local immobility. The serf might be sent away to push his fortune and to shift for himself, on condition of paying a tax to his owner, who was no longer answerable for him. This tribute was called *obrok*. It seemed a profitable arrangement to both parties, but it served to demoralise still further the whole system, to create a Russian proletariat, and to impoverish the village communities. For it happened often that all the able-bodied men were sent off in this way, to get money for their masters, and none but women, children, and old men remained at home. At first, therefore, bondage had been introduced by the nobles for their own advantage. But with the growth of the despotic monarchy, and with the increase of its exactions and of its pressure upon themselves, they became more and more exacting in the treatment of their serfs, and shifted upon them the burdens which the Czar imposed upon themselves. The servitude of the peasant is only a consequence of the despotism of the State. The time has now come when the interests of the same despotism demand its abolition. All that was done for the relief of the peasantry under Nicholas aimed at the total destruction of the social influence of the aristocracy.

European Russia, with a territory



eleven times as large as that of France, has less than double the population of France; and the public revenue is less than one-third of the French. The reason of this national poverty, in spite of the great fertility of part of the country, lies chiefly in the institution of serfdom. The serf is a bad and indolent workman. Count Bernstoff converted the serfs on his estates in Poland into tenant farmers, at an expense of 15,000*l*. His income rose in 24 years from 450*l*. to 4000*l*. The rate of reproduction of wheat increased from 3 for 1 to 8½ for 1. The produce of an estate cultivated by serfs is less than the cost of the labour if it was paid for at the price it would otherwise fetch. That is to say, that comparing the value of the labouring power and the value of the produce, the land is cultivated at a loss to the nation. But whilst the State was thus interested in the abolition of serfdom, a change became necessary for the safety of the nobles. Their unpopularity has become so great, that many do not dare to live on their estates, and on an average 73 proprietors are annually murdered by their serfs. Both the government and the aristocracy were therefore agreed as to the necessity of emancipation, though not as to the mode.

"A row of gentlemen along the streets  
Suspended may illuminate mankind,  
As also bonfires made of country-seats."

By the Crimean war, that which had been a matter of policy became a matter of necessity. For two years trade and commerce were interrupted, the factories had ceased to work, and the land was imperfectly tilled. The alteration in the whole life of the people was so great and so universal, that it was impossible to think of returning to the old state of things. It became evident, that after the peace a new era would begin, and society would have to find a new footing. In all but the north-eastern governments the whole population had been called to arms by the month of October 1855. All who took the cross became exempt from the civil law. The landlords lost their jurisdiction, and could find nobody to employ, whilst the families of their peasants were left upon their hands. The limits fixed for the age at which men were bound to serve

were exceeded, so as to include many of those who had not reached and of those who had passed it. In the one year 1855, 738,955 men joined the army. Even the Jews, who were exempt from conscription when they joined the Russian church, a manoeuvre which the government had found highly successful, lost that privilege.

The loss was far greater in proportion than the force supplied. This has always been the case in the Russian armies, from the extent and climate of the country, and from the low organisation and defective treatment which are a consequence of the state of society. The recruits are originally serfs; and the common soldier is so little thought of, that it was a usual punishment to condemn criminals to military service. Add to this the corruption of the official world, and the prodigious losses can be explained. In 1812, the armies opposed to Napoleon amounted to 210,000 men; between June and December they had lost 169,519. Of a reinforcement of 10,000 men, sent to Wilna, only 1,700 reached the scene of action. Only 15,000 men pursued the main French army across the frontier. In 1828 and 1829, 115,000 Russians invaded Turkey, of whom only 15,000 returned. In the course of 1854, the Russian loss was 111,132. In four months 40,000 died at Simpheropol, and 100,000 lay in the hospitals of the neighbourhood.

Not a man remained for peaceful pursuits; all the resources of the empire were absorbed in the war. A civilised nation could not have borne this mode of defence, and even Russia could not bear it without a great change in its condition. The blockade of the Baltic ports was felt more deeply than the victories of the Allies. The importation of raw material, on which all the industry of Russia depends, and which cannot bear the expense of land transport, entirely ceased. The price of many commodities rose 500 per cent. The taxes have produced 3,000,000*l*. a year less since the war; whilst 300,000,000 roubles have been added to the debt. All this pressed most heavily on the nobles, and the continuation of the war would have led to their complete ruin. The government waited until the nobility

acknowledged the necessity of peace; for then it shifted from its own shoulders the unpopularity of admitting the defeat, and the impossibility of carrying on the war, and at the same time knew that it could take advantage of the distress and weakness of the nobles to accomplish the reforms of which they had been the stronger opponents. Immediately after the peace of Paris, Alexander II. addressed the following words to the nobility of Moscow: "The greatest success in war does not make up for the evils that accompany it. It has interrupted the trade of the empire with most of the European nations. Undoubtedly I should have continued the contest had not the voice of neighbouring nations condemned the policy of the last years. . . . Even if fortune had been always as faithful to our arms as it continued to be in Asia, the empire would have exhausted its resources by keeping up great armies in several quarters, especially as the soldiers were taken away from the fields and the factories. Even in the government of Moscow the factories were shut up. I prefer the real prosperity of the arts of peace to the empty glory of battles." The difficulties began when the army returned. The men expected to receive their freedom in return for their military service. They carried into their homes the habit of bearing arms, the feeling of their claims and of their power. Again the burden fell upon the nobles, who had to provide for the disbanded troops. The aristocracy became more and more helpless and dependent on the crown. It became evident that some great measure must be taken to restore order in society, which the war had disorganised, and to satisfy the aspirations it had awakened. The official classes suffered as much morally from the war as the nobles suffered materially. The corruption was brought to light in an astounding degree. The sums which were discovered after a strict inquiry to have been stolen in the administration of the army during the war exceeded 16,000,000*l.* All this favoured the claims of the serfs. What helped them most was the financial difficulty. The empire required the creation of new sources of wealth. Accordingly

the first act after the war was the decree announcing a vast system of railways; the next was the commencement of a series of measures for the development of the industrial resources of the lower classes, for serfdom cramps production. These measures are always described as being designed for the improvement of the peasant population—they tend naturally to emancipation. But it is a fact which has never been concealed or disguised by the Russian press, that the object which all these measures of economical development and social improvement are destined to attain, is the supremacy of Russia in Europe.

The emancipation was inaugurated by a rescript, dated 2d December 1857, in which the Emperor empowered the nobles of Lithuania to consult about the means of improving the condition of the labouring classes. At the same time the wish was expressed, that the nobles of other governments would take counsel for the same end. This was responded to by addresses from the majority of the governments. The manner of their inquiry, and the principles which were to guide them, were then determined. The landlord is to retain the ownership of his whole estate, the peasant having the right to purchase the freehold of his house and garden. The peasant, moreover, is to have the use of as much land as he requires to satisfy the demands of the State and of his landlord, and for the maintenance of his family. In return for this he must pay the landlord either in money or in labour. This is the principle which the nobility of different governments were to adapt to local exigencies. The first objection to it was, that as the right of migration would be restored, the peasant could not be forced either to cultivate the land or to pay for his own portion either in money or labour. In order to provide against the notorious restlessness of the Russian peasant, it was resolved that the purchase of house and homestead should be compulsory, "in order," said the minister, "to prevent a pernicious restlessness and vagrancy in the country population." It must be paid for, in money or in labour, within fifteen years. At present, however, the peasant regards his

house as his property, his only property indeed. It is a poor inducement, therefore, for him to remain there, that he is to work hard for years, in order to secure a legal possession, which has, as it is, never been disputed. This law greatly increases his burdens, without any corresponding advantage. The purchase of farm-land is optional; but the purchase of the farm-buildings being compulsory, the choice is scarcely free. So that the uncertain prospect of future freedom is offered to the impatient and excited serf at the price of oppressive labour, which is to be immediately exacted of him. Whilst the nobles were threatened with a heavy loss, the peasants had as little as possible to hope for. The resistance to this proposal came chiefly from the lesser nobles, who, possessing only a few serfs, who worked for themselves and paid them a certain tribute, were threatened with ruin. Now there are 45,000 proprietors of less than 20 serfs. Accordingly many refused to attend the meetings to which they were summoned, and little progress was made. A new rescript, of February 1858, attempted to encourage and promote the work and to reassure the nobles. A period of twelve years was fixed for the practical result of their deliberations, and a central committee was appointed at Petersburg. The committees of the several governments began now to work in earnest, and by the beginning of this year they had, for the most part, sent in their report. None object to the government proposal, but all are alarmed at the consequences of emancipation without compensation to the nobility. The universal feeling of the magnitude of the revolution which is in progress manifests itself in the claims which the nobles advance, and in their general bearing. When Alexander I. expressed his wish for the emancipation of the serfs, he was reminded of the manner of his father's death, and said no more. Under Alexander II. the emancipation has become so urgently necessary for the existence of the State, that the opposition is powerless. But it is not less general; for all the conditions under which it can be safely carried out are wanting, and the government has done nothing to prepare the way.

As soon as it began to be spoken of, the price of land fell fifty per cent. The committee of nobles at Petersburg declared that if the bondage of the peasantry is a usurpation of the nobility, the absolutism of the Czar is not less a usurpation, and just as recent. They demanded, therefore, as an equivalent for the rights they were about to lose, a wholesale restoration of the state of things which subsisted before Peter the Great, and especially the revival of the *Duma*, the parliament of the old Russian aristocracy. The deputies of the several governments assembled at Petersburg in the course of the autumn refused to accept the proposals of General Rostoffoff, the head of the central committee, and applied to the Emperor for permission to return to their homes. At the end of last year one of the leading deputies, Besobrasoff, published a separate protest against any settlement of the question which should not proceed from an assembly of notables. He was instantly banished from the capital. The most memorable and instructive document of all is the report of the nobles of the important government of Tver: "We acknowledge that the Emperor's design must be realised. But we require compensation such as the State concedes at every expropriation for the public good. For we must be enabled to pay the debts we have contracted on the credit of our existing property, in order that we may at least terminate our political, moral, and material existence with honour and a clean conscience. For we are convinced that the condition in which we shall be placed after the abolition of serfdom will destroy the Russian nobility and reduce it to an historical tradition." In the government of Wladimir several hundred nobles signed an address to the Emperor demanding, as an equivalent for the sacrifices demanded of them, the abolition of titles and hereditary rank, equality of all Russians before the law, freedom of the press, decentralisation, election of government officials, trial by jury, &c.

That a constitutional change in the empire will be an inevitable consequence of the emancipation is the conviction of many leading men. The president of the ministry in par-

ticular, Prince Orloff, uses this as an argument for delay. It is in consequence of a dispute with him that the Grandduke Constantine, the most energetic supporter of emancipation, left the central committee. The popular leader in the work, General Rostoffzoff, became the object of the vehement dislike of the Conservatives. At a public dinner to which he was invited, his health was received with groans. His strength gave way under the heavy responsibility with which he was charged. During his illness little progress was made, and the agitation among the aristocracy increased. Rostoffzoff died on February 18, and was succeeded in the conduct of the emancipation by Count Panin, Minister of Justice and a Conservative. This reactionary appointment heightened the general excitement. The universities have become centres of Liberal opinions. At Charkow the students have framed a constitution for the empire. The Radical and Conservative parties are at open war. In this state of things the deputies of the remaining governments that had not been represented in the first group, last September, assembled at Petersburg. In the beginning of March the Emperor addressed them in the following words: "I wish the condition of the peasants to become not a phrase, but a fact, and that the great change may be accomplished without convulsions. Without some sacrifice on your part, this is impossible; but I desire that the sacrifices of the nobility may be as slight and as imperceptible as possible. I know that there are absurd reports abroad, which may have reached you. It is said that I have withdrawn my confidence from the nobles. That is a falsehood and a calumny. Do not attend to it: but believe me." The discussions began again with great activity between the central committee and the deputies, and lasted often six or eight hours a day. Count Panin, instead of resisting the whole

measure, proves anxious to remove opposition by considering the rights of the nobles.

The difficulty for the government is not only to satisfy the claims of property, but to maintain the absolute authority of the crown, whilst it consults the interests and wishes of a part of the nation. This introduces a new principle into the Russian system. As the nobles only are consulted, and the people, whose interests are chiefly at stake, are not allowed to take part in the deliberations, there is an obvious injustice in the mode of proceeding. It would have been more consistent with justice to the people and with the traditions of the State, if the act of emancipation had been, like the ukase of 1723, which legalised servitude, the free resolution of the crown. Fear of the nobles prevented it, and threatens to make the measures of the government ineffective. A reform of the social condition of Russia is inseparably connected, as all understand, with a reform of the political system, and must be preceded by it. It is impossible for the government to retrace its steps, or deceive the universal expectation. So far nothing has come of it, except manifestations of opinion by which the government is weakened. A solution would be possible by the disappearance of all the smaller proprietors of land and serfs, in whom the opposition resides; for they are threatened with destruction, while the great owners may find their profit in the change. But if the small estates are bought up, the aristocracy will obtain a concentrated power which it is the political object of emancipation to destroy, while the large estates will make the improvement of the cultivation still more difficult. The only probable result of the undertaking, as it now stands, will be an enormous increase of the aggressive power of Russia, without any security at home against tyranny, or any restraint upon ambition.

# THE RAMBLER.

---

VOL. III. *New Series.*

SEPTEMBER 1860.

PART IX.

---

## NATIONAL DEFENCE.

A PHILOSOPHER once said that he had never known any body who was made wiser by the experience of others, nor, he added after a moment's reflection, even by his own. The people of England have lately shown an example of the former virtue, certainly the most unusual and most difficult of the two ; for the defeat of the Austrians in Lombardy has brought about changes in this country more weighty and more extensive than in Austria herself. Strange to say, we became filled with dismay and suspicion in the midst of a war which we applauded and of triumphs at which we rejoiced. By far the majority of Englishmen looked forward hopefully to the deliverance of Italy, whilst in Ireland vast numbers of seditious ballads celebrated the progress of the allies. Our neighbour's house was on fire, and we laughed at his distress. All our sympathies were on one side, though our interests were all on the other. But there is a sound sense of what suits their own advantage in the character of Englishmen, and the influence of false principles and of political prejudices could not long prevail. Before the Italian war was over, a movement commenced among the people which we consider one of the most honourable and one of the most momentous events in our history. The Rifle Volunteers are a new feature in the constitution of the body politic, and the sign of an altered time. Their motto, "Defence, not defiance," could not conceal for a moment the real motive and character of the institution.

Five years ago our fleet and our army were suffering and conquering side by side with the French. The Emperor was received with vociferous applause in London, and the peaceful purposes of the works at Cherbourg were so little disputed

that the Queen went over to admire them. In 1857 we despatched all our available forces to India, and obtained for some of them permission to traverse France. Such was the confidence that then prevailed, that a popular outcry was raised because the Government refused to send the steamships of war to the Indian Ocean. In that time of danger and disaster the Emperor stood loyally by us, as he had done in the Russian war. His phrases and declamations about the alliance and the progress of civilisation, which were believed and echoed in this country, were never belied by his policy towards us. Even the Italian expedition was popular here. Those who, like the *Saturday Review*, understood its real character, and believed that the Austrians were fighting our battles, were unable to withstand the charm of success, and triumphed with the French. The imputation of Austrian sympathies was used not unsuccessfully against Lord Derby's government at the moment of its fall by the partisans of men whom it would be more just to accuse of antipathy for Austria. Then came the news of Solferino and Villafranca, and a few weeks later a change had come over the spirit of the land; the Government that had been helped to office by the Italian sentiments of its three most conspicuous members began to consider the necessity of spending millions for the fortification of our dockyards, and for the indefinite increase of our fleet; and a nation of pacific shopkeepers were arming against the magnanimous ally who had just humbled Austria, delivered Italy, and threatened the Pope.

The fairest test of the importance and vitality of the movement which then took its rise is supplied by considering the difficulties and the improbability of success which attended its commencement. Men who were notoriously friendly to the Emperor were at the head of the Government. Lord Palmerston had figured in a scarlet coat at Compiègne at the very time when the invasion of Lombardy was projected, and his constant endeavour at the Foreign Office had been to thwart and injure Austria. The Foreign Secretary was well known as the time-honoured advocate of those principles of an ordinary and superficial Liberalism which pervade the Continent, and have served in France as the soundest foundation of despotism. All men were aware that he would not be an inflexible upholder of the faith of treaties; that he respected popular aspirations more than established rights; and that, in conformity to the Foxite tradition, he would prefer a revolutionary to a legitimate prince.

Above all, the purse-strings of the nation were in the hands of Mr. Gladstone. As to his opinions there could be no

mistake. He was one of the earliest enthusiasts of Italian independence. He had denounced the King of Naples; he had translated Farini; he had proclaimed Leopardi. He was the associate of men who in the term "patriot" combine an indistinct fusion of the conspirator and the assassin. It was hardly possible, therefore, but that he should feel a particular attraction towards the Emperor Napoleon. Mr. Gladstone was perhaps the only eminent man who entertained that species of admiration for him which is so common among those who think that villany and success are infallible proofs of ability. This tendency was strengthened by considerations of home policy. As an economist, and as the organ by which the Manchester party were led captive, he was compelled to resist every unnecessary expense for preparations for war. His financial reputation depended on his being able to redeem in 1860 the pledges of 1853. Moreover, Mr. Gladstone has a natural aversion for war, and a love of economy, beyond what is expected of a Chancellor of the Exchequer, and almost enough to satisfy even the demands of the Manchester school. He was likely, therefore, both from interest and from conviction, to argue that the Emperor deserved confidence, and even gratitude for his Italian campaign, and that there was no need of defensive armaments against him. Indeed, this was so obviously his interest, that it was certain to become, by a transition which in his mind is necessary and instantaneous, his sincere and deliberate conviction. For Mr. Gladstone is equally remarkable for the highest moral integrity and rectitude and for the utmost intellectual duplicity. He is at the same time the most honest and the most deceitful of public men. His excessive earnestness of conviction is the great secret of the persuasiveness of his eloquence; but that earnestness is founded on an incredible power of persuading himself. Unfortunately he can convince himself as well as others of what he wishes to believe, or to be believed. He cannot see the flaw in his own case, though in an adversary's nothing escapes him. Hence that fatal instability of purpose which is, rather than inconsistency of opinion, the bane of his career. In this question he has exhibited perfect consistency, and has displayed ostentatiously his disbelief in the grounds for alarm which have provoked such vast expenditure, and his disgust at the ignorant patience of taxation shown by the people.

An administration so constituted, and enjoying the support of Mr. Bright, promised nothing but peace and conciliation with France, and offered no great likelihood of a budget of 77 millions this year. It seemed probable that we should

merely engage in an amicable emulation with the Emperor Napoleon, to see who should do most for the happiness of Italy; and whether the Subalpine kingdom would have more reason to be grateful to those who by diplomacy wished to obtain the unity of Italy, or to him who made war for Italian liberty, but preferred to keep the Austrians at Venice, in order that he might continue to be a necessary, and therefore a predominant ally. The Government simply announced that it would continue the preparations made by their predecessors in office to place our navy on a level with that of France. Things might have gone on in this way, and Mr. Gladstone's counsels might have prevailed to the last, but for an unforeseen event which occurred out of doors. This was the establishment of permanent volunteer rifle corps.

Neither the history of this nor of any other country offered a precedent for this, and there seemed to be hardly more encouragement for it in the state of public opinion than in the policy of the Cabinet. Soldiering has never been popular amongst us. Except in times of war, the army has been generally looked upon with jealousy by the people. No efforts have ever been made in peaceful times to provide a large force, such as subsists in most European countries. It has never been felt as a necessity for home-defence. Until the Russian war, the state of the Continent did not affect the size of our army. The navy was thought sufficient to protect us, and the numbers of the army were fixed according to the exigencies of colonial service. People were totally unaccustomed to the notion that a home-force is required for our security. The only power that could think of invading us was the Emperor of the French, and with him there was no quarrel. When last volunteers were called out in England, there were pressing reasons for it, and the panic was not absurd. The first Napoleon was at Boulogne with an army that was about to win Austerlitz, and he had prepared all things for a descent on England. The peril was great and immediate, and soon over, and the volunteers were not long under arms. But now there was no provocation, no declared enemy, no threat of invasion. If any thing required to be provided for, it was no momentary or transitory danger, but an altered state of the world, and whatever was done must be done for good. There was nothing to excite enthusiasm, and enthusiasm was not enough. Great and permanent sacrifices were necessary, or the rifle movement would be merely a pastime and a farce. Every thing that weighs most with the practical Englishman appeared to discourage it: the Crown did not call for volunteers; the Government



held aloof. Great military authorities spoke most unfavourably of their probable efficiency. The democratic party reviled and sneered at them. They had to run the gauntlet of ridicule in every street of London. No eminent or conspicuous person took the lead. Nevertheless a year has scarcely elapsed, and the Volunteers have triumphed over all these obstacles. The War-office has organised and directed the formation of the corps; the Queen has reviewed them in Hyde Park and at Holyrood; Sir John Burgoyne has withdrawn his first opinion; ridicule is silent, and the street-boys hold their tongues.

It has been the work of the aristocratic classes, and it has been made possible by the events of last summer, and by the discovery that France would make war for an idea. It is right that those who are the natural leaders of the people should take the foremost place in a work in which rank has no privileges, and in which service is not paid. The progress of events deprives them of many artificial advantages which they held from their position in society, and which they will recover as volunteers. They will do more for the rifle movement than they will get from it; for they possess in the highest degree the qualifications which it demands—leisure, money, and that power of excelling in a pursuit without being trained for it which belongs peculiarly to the rowing, hunting, boxing, adventurous young gentlemen of England. An aristocracy ceases to be an aristocracy if it fails to take the lead in the movement of the age. In Sparta certain trades were forbidden, because they would have raised up a new nobility; and it is for a similar reason that in the middle ages there was so close a union between the nobles and the Church. The democratic character of the Catholic clergy was the safety of the nobles, because it gave an opening and a career to all the talents in the lower orders. In the same way, by the free competition which throws open all the chances of success to ambition, an aristocracy is still preserved in its integrity and its strength by allowing itself to be revived by the same means by which it was originally created. Nobility is properly an element of progress, for it subsists only on condition of moving in the front rank. Where it feels unable to keep the lead, it tries to maintain itself by impeding the general advance. Aristocracy, says Chateaubriand, has three successive ages: the age of superiority, the age of privileges, the age of vanities; proceeding from the first, it degenerates in the second, and expires in the third. Ours is still in the first age. The most promising sign for the success of the volunteer movement is the part

taken by the upper class in conducting it. Its chief danger and its greatest defect is its exclusive character, and the insufficient support it has received from the lower classes. Unless it extends farther and deeper, it will not be strongly rooted. It can only confirm the influence of the higher classes if all join in it, and if the aristocratic commanders are placed at the head of other orders of the people besides their own. This is the rock ahead of the whole innovation. While peace lasts, labouring men cannot afford time for drill or money for accoutrements; and when the period for action arrives, they will not easily or willingly combine with a force which has already assumed a distinctly exclusive character. This difficulty must be overcome, or else the Volunteers will disorganise instead of uniting the community; they will widen and define the interval between the classes; they will provoke instead of disarming revolutionary tendencies, and will be the army of a class, not of a nation.

But the political consequences of the creation of a volunteer army extend far beyond the mere confirmation of aristocratic influence. It places in the hands of those classes most attached to the constitution the means of resisting, in all time to come, the exercise of arbitrary power. Jealousy of a standing army has been one of the chief securities of our institutions. Liberty can never be secure in the presence of a large force of mercenaries. The disappearance of the unbought armies of the feudal age, and the introduction of troops who served for pay, led to the establishment of absolute monarchy in Europe. It rendered the sovereign wholly independent of the nation, and separated the people from the State. It would be a dreadful thing, said Burke, if there were any power in this country of strength enough to oppose with effect the general wishes of the people. This is just what an army receiving the pay of the State is intended to do. The time has now arrived when we shall be always obliged to keep a considerable armed force at home. Who can say what circumstances may not hereafter arise which may make its presence dangerous here, as it has been every where else? Who can believe for an instant that Reform or Emancipation would ever have been carried if the Government had had a force at hand proportioned to the armies of other states? We must have lost the instinctive foresight which has made us great in politics, if we had not provided, together with the means of defence against the enemy, a security against their abuse. By our volunteer army we have doubled our military force, and have doubled also our constitutional safeguards.

We have provided at the same time the most effectual security against insurrection. The Volunteers are no protection to the State against the people, but to property against spoliation, and to society against socialism. They have armed the upper and middle classes, and will arm as many of the lower class as are ready to join the others. They will make revolution as impossible as invasion, and will be as effective a barrier against ochlocracy as against tyranny. They will verify the prophecy made by a great writer nearly a century ago, that "nothing is more certain than that in a hundred years a national militia will be every where the chief element of defence, and will form a new security for freedom and property, which, if our present mode of government continues, must otherwise be destroyed."

Other countries have sought for protection against a standing army in the establishment of a national guard. With this the Volunteers bear no analogy whatever; they are the creation of a totally different state of society. When the mass of the nation is in opposition to the sovereign power, it requires an armed force in order to be able to hold its own. Originally the creation of the national guard was an act of defiance and a proof of suspicion against the crown. In later times it has been the army of the *bourgeoisie* against the mob, the bulwark of property, independently of the authority of the State, and even in spite of it. The national guard is therefore in its nature revolutionary. It serves neither the State nor the nation, but a single interest and a single class of society. Where the sovereignty is in the hands of the nation, and there is no jealousy consequently either of the State or of the masses, that is to say, in all democracies, army and national guard are one and the same. But the Volunteers have taken up the rifle against a foreign adversary; they are not the result of suspicion, and whilst they exist they will prevent the rise of an antagonism between the people and the State, and between property and labour, and will be a bond of union as well as a protection.

They will save us, not only from a national guard, but from the greater evil of conscription. A people that relies on a permanent system of compulsory military service, resembles the statesman who declared himself ready to sacrifice not only a part, but the whole of the constitution, in order to preserve the remainder. It is a system by which one great liberty is surrendered and all are imperilled, and it is a surrender, not of rights only, but also of power. In every sense, therefore, the Volunteers are a safeguard of our institutions as well

as of our independence, and are as important in a political as they are in a military point of view.

Standing armies alone have not preserved any European country from a successful invasion. In 1805 Napoleon crossed the Rhine, 25th September, and dictated the peace of Presburg, 26th December. In 1806 he entered Berlin a fortnight after the first encounter with the Prussians. In 1814 the allies took only three months to march from the Rhine to Paris. Centralisation increases the power of attack, but diminishes that of defence. In 1809 Tyrol held out longer than Austria in 1805 or France in 1814. It is, however, a question of civilisation even more than of centralisation. A highly civilised people possesses great resources for offensive purposes; a barbarous people is powerful in defence. It is impossible to concentrate in a regular army all the moral, or even the material, resources of a nation. They can act only spontaneously, and are not to be had to order. They can be reckoned upon only in a free country. An absolute monarch either will not venture to call the nation to arms, or if he does, it must lead to great internal changes, if not to revolution. But in a free country it is the natural mode of defence. There a large standing army is not tolerated, and every class is identified with the Government. All that the State can do is, therefore, to assist and to sustain, as far as art can do it, the resistance of the whole people.

In this respect the ministers have wisely and worthily followed the expectation and the example of the people. The efforts which have been made with so much enthusiasm and with so many substantial sacrifices, have been supported in such a way as to increase their military importance without affecting their political character. The way in which volunteers can be made equal to regulars is to supply them with artificial defences. Some of the greatest sieges in history have been sustained by men not trained to arms. The chief authority amongst us on fortification, Sir John Burgoyne, who began by declaring that a volunteer army would not stand against one-tenth their number of regular troops, considers that they would be perfectly sufficient for the defence of fortresses. Therefore, by means of a large immediate expenditure on fortifications, troops that cost the country hardly any thing are raised to an equality with the line, for a special service, and our army will become the cheapest instead of the dearest in the world.

To be chary of the lives of the people is a characteristic which belongs to a free nation as much as prodigality of human life belongs to the character of a despotic prince. All

that money and art can accomplish ought to be done to protect those to whom we look for protection. It behoves us to relieve our soldiers as much as possible of the burdens and sufferings of war. In this also the experience of last year ought to warn us. The loss of the allies at Solferino exceeded by many thousands that of the defeated army. The legitimate monarch was bound to spare his men; the despot could afford to waste lives to gain his purpose. It is hard, and it would be wrong, for Englishmen to meet such a foe on equal terms. We spend millions to save human life in time of peace, by means of lighthouses, breakwaters, and harbours of refuge; we have no right to grudge the millions that are to furnish shelter for our soldiers, especially our Volunteers. The fortifications are the natural and necessary complement of the enrolment of the new force.

They are not even open to the charge of expense compared with the enormous increase of the fleet which is asked for on the one hand, or the addition to the army which is demanded on the other. Their purpose is purely defensive. Every thing that gives an advantage to defence is of an essentially pacific tendency. The only way in which our power of resistance could be increased without increasing the means, and therefore the temptation, of aggression, was by creating a volunteer force, and fortifying the chief points of the coast. Every thing else would tend to provoke war; these tend to prevent it. They serve as a shield, not as a sword. In the debates on the fortifications of Paris, M. Guizot said, that if other countries would imitate the example of France, by fortifying their capitals, war would become impossible. In the same discussion it was affirmed, that the measure would be really economical, because it would allow the army to be reduced by 200,000 men. We are doing what we can by strengthening our sea-defences, and accepting the voluntary service of the people; and by these measures combined we shall be able to defy our great military neighbour, and to escape the danger of his proximity and of his example.

We cannot, however, escape a great change in our whole system, neither can we disguise the fact that now is the commencement of a new era of our national existence. It has been argued that riflemen and fortifications are to be eschewed, because it is un-English to skulk behind stone-walls, or to hide while taking a shot. Still we must accept a mode of warfare that has been introduced in consequence of an altered state of things, both in the political world and in military science, which deprives this country of much of its ancient character.

We have lost that immunity from invasion which we so long enjoyed. However improbable or hazardous the attempt may be, it is no longer absolutely impracticable. Steam has thrown a bridge across the Channel from every French port to every point of the 300 miles of our coast where an enemy could land. A great military writer, convinced of the danger of trusting to the fleet alone, has said that we should be safer if we had no fleet. There can, however, be little doubt that the altered mode of warfare will ultimately result in our advantage, and will increase our superiority. But this will not restore our former security until it has been proved.

It is not, however, the introduction of steam men-of-war, which have existed for many years, or any calculations of military men, that has produced so extraordinary a revolution in the habits and feelings of our countrymen. They believed until last year that the good faith of our neighbours would preserve us from attack, and that our fleet would be enough for our defence. But although Austria is unpopular because it is supposed to be not only a despotic but a retrograde state, and a great protector of Popery, and although a nation struggling for independence is a grateful spectacle to Englishmen, yet the invasion of Lombardy was secretly felt to be a crime, and the arguments by which it was justified were obviously just as capable of being applied to any similar act elsewhere. The feeling of security and confidence was destroyed for ever. There were more occasions for dispute between France and England than between France and Austria; for there is hardly a point of the compass where our interests are not in contradiction with each other. It is more easy to find a powerful ally against England than against Austria; and the revolutionary and national principle can be appealed to as well in one case as in the other. Besides, the popular antipathy is most violent against us, whilst against the Austrians it does not exist. Last, and above all, there is an irrepressible antagonism between the principles of government and the social habits of the two countries. England and Austria represent two different ages; England and France represent two different civilisations. Neither the French nor the English have forgotten the part we played in the last generations, when the words which Demosthenes spoke to the Athenians might have been applied to England: "It is your constitution above all against which Philip makes war. He knows that his power can never be secure whilst popular government subsists among you. To you it is not given to seize power over others; but in this you are powerful, to forbid another to get possession of power, or, if he has it, to wrest

it from him. For every oppressor your government is a hindrance, and a safety for all who are oppressed."

Our danger lies not so much in the ambition of the French Emperor as in the state of the French people. Under Louis Philippe, the democracy which afforded an insecure basis for the throne already began to give way to a military despotism, the natural end of democracies. In the midst of the constant insurrections in Paris, after the Revolution of 1830, the plan of fortifying Paris by means of detached forts was presented to the Chamber. The republicans rejected the measure because, they said, it was directed against the population of Paris. But in 1840 it was revived by M. Thiers, and was adopted on condition that in addition to the detached forts Paris should be surrounded by walls. This was supposed to be a guarantee that the whole plan was designed against a foreign enemy. M. Guizot very frankly explained the political character of the fortifications. "For ten years," he said, "we have laboured, in spite of all opposition, to establish a policy of order and of peace. Do not refuse to the defenders of this cause the only means of making it prevail. For ten years the party of a rational policy has been predominant in Europe; but there are at the same time both in France and elsewhere many men of evil designs and warlike passions, who always think revolutions possible, and always try to produce them. And there are also, under the name of conservatives, thoughtless and passionate men, who expect or even hope for revolutions in France as a consequence of war. These men must be cured of their errors. The government, the constitution, the head and the heart of France, must be saved from these dangers. We must convince Europe that a revolution is not possible in France. The party of a good and conservative policy throughout Europe will receive an immense service, and the fortifications of Paris will be of use to all governments." In truth, it raised the personal government of the crown above all parties, and gave it a power which there were no means of controlling or of resisting, except by force. If the king had possessed ambition, energy, and popularity with the army, it would have been possible in 1846 to bring France to something very like her present condition. Every thing turned on the attachment of the army. Fourteen years ago, a great writer, who well understood the meaning of what he saw, pointed out the consequences of this state of things in a centralised country. "The fatal strength of the fortifications of Paris will," he wrote, "scarcely be tried while Louis Philippe lives. Such a trial would be, under all circumstances, a great peril for the king himself. But

how with his successors? Can it be hoped that they will pursue the same course?"

War is the great instrument by which a power such as this is retained. It is one of the necessities of the position of a ruler of France, and no prince can hesitate to employ the means which are required for his very existence. "Something new must be done every three months," said the first Napoleon, "to captivate the imagination of the French people; with them, he that does not advance is lost." Things will not be improved by the death or the fall of Napoleon III. Abler and more unscrupulous men may be found among those who look for the reversion of his power. The worst that can be said of him is, that he absolutely ignores all moral considerations in pursuing the policy which is dictated by the instinct of self-preservation. He obtained his crown by immoral means; it is idle to complain that he preserves it in the same manner. He is strong and popular in France; it is absurd to separate him from the people as the object of special indignation. Nothing can be less inscrutable or more easy to calculate than his policy; nothing more certain than that some day a war with England will suit his interests, and that when that time comes he will not hesitate to declare it.

### THE PRISON-DISCIPLINE ACT.

WE take it as an admitted principle, that it is no part of the punishment which the law intends to inflict on any malefactor that he shall be deprived of the means of worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience, or that he shall be either directly or indirectly punished for his religion as well as for his offence. Yet under the existing system of prison-discipline both these things are done. The imprisoned Catholic is denied the means of worship; and if, whilst he is undergoing his sentence, he abstains from acts distinctly forbidden by his Church, his punishment is greatly increased.

In fact, a judge might very well express himself much as follows in passing sentence on a Catholic prisoner:

*Judge.* Prisoner at the bar, you have been convicted of a very serious offence, and it is my duty to sentence you to three months' imprisonment. Are you a member of the Church of England, or do you belong to any other denomination?

*Prisoner.* Please your lordship, I am no denomination; I am a Catholic.

*Judge.* In that case, then, I have further to sentence you



to three months' abstinence from the worship of God, except so far as you can do this in the solitude of your cell; and also, unless you can get over your scruples and attend the services of the Church of England, to solitary confinement in your cell for three hours every Sunday, and for from three quarters of an hour to an hour on other days. But you will be asked once a week whether you require the assistance of a minister of your denomination; and if you answer affirmatively, your minister, if he can conveniently be communicated with, will be allowed, at your or his own expense, to pay you a visit for each such affirmative answer.

No English judge could prevail on himself to make such an address to a prisoner; it would be too humiliating to himself, too overt a sarcasm on the laws he would be administering. Lord Campbell himself could hardly put the facts so as to elicit a welcome but dear-bought cheer from an ultra-Protestant audience.

Let us see how this indefensible, and no doubt in great measure accidental, state of things has arisen.

The sentence on the Catholic prisoner depends on the construction of two acts of parliament, supposing that his sentence, independently of the addition made to it because he is a Catholic, is passed upon him under some act of parliament. The first act would award him a sentence common to himself and others; the second, or that under which he is in effect sentenced to further punishment for being a Catholic (we need not say that no such words as we have put into the mouth of the judge are ever used), grows out of the Prison-Discipline Act, 4 Geo. IV. c. 64.

We have said that the wrong is no doubt in great measure accidental. It has, in fact, grown out of the words of an act of parliament, not out of the intention of the Legislature.

This view is supportable out of the act itself, and is strengthened, well-nigh up to the point of demonstration, by the analogy to be drawn from other acts of the Legislature, and by the admitted principles of legislation. In fact, in speaking of this view as "supportable" by the evidence of the act itself, and as "well-nigh" demonstrable only, we understate the case we are about to establish. On the words of the act itself, we are able to claim its own revision as a logically necessary consequence to be drawn from its own expressions. But this neither is, nor should be, enough to establish the claim we are about to advance: for there are two ways of restoring logical agreement between the expressed intention and the contradictory or inconsistent enactment of

the same document; the one would be by alterations which would make it conformable to what we shall show to be its intention by its own words, the other by expunging or altering those sentences on which we shall rely as expressing the intention of parliament. But we shall further show that this latter process is inadmissible on grounds drawn from the analogy of other acts of parliament; and we shall also, throwing aside all technical reasons, show that an alteration of the cited act in the sense of meting out only an equal degree of punishment to Catholics and Protestants, besides being abstractedly just, would also turn out for the good of the community, Catholic and Protestant alike. And we purpose in this article to omit all considerations which would affect the minds of Catholics only,—such, for instance, as the salvation of souls and the greater glory of God,—and to confine ourselves to principles admitted by Protestants, and to reasoning which a Catholic might address to an ultra-Protestant who accepted the propositions that a man should no longer be punishable in England for being a Catholic, and that, outside the Act of Settlement, and any endowments or privileges conferred by law on the Establishment, all orders, lay or clerical, should be equal in the eye of the law; so that, apart from the succession to the crown, and the reservations of the Emancipation Act, it should be an idle and futile question to ask a man his religion as a base on which to ground any penal treatment, or any exclusion from any office or employment not necessarily importing his adhesion to the established religion.

The preamble of the Prison-Discipline Act (4 Geo. IV. c. 64) recites as follows. We have put into italics those words to which we shall have occasion particularly to refer :

“Whereas the laws now existing relative to the building, repairing, and *regulating* of gaols and houses of correction in England and Wales are complicated, and have in many cases been *found ineffective* : and whereas it is expedient that such measures should be adopted and such arrangements made in prisons as shall not only provide for the safe custody, but shall also tend more effectually to *preserve the health* and to *improve the morals*, of the prisoners confined therein, and shall *insure the proper measure of punishment* to convicted offenders : and whereas due classification, inspection, regular labour and employment, and *religious and moral instruction* are *essential* to the *discipline of a prison*, and to the *reformation of offenders* : and whereas,” &c. &c. ;

the remainder being immaterial.

The act, then, is for the *regulation* of prisons, the existing rules having been found *ineffective*. The points of inef-

iciency are pretty obvious from what follows, even if it were not otherwise known that gaols were dirty and unhealthy, and had become, not only places of confinement and punishment, but hotbeds of vice and immorality. Accordingly the object of the act is to *preserve the health* and to *improve the morals* of prisoners. And the way to set about this last job is expressly declared to be to provide *religious and moral instruction*, which is declared to be not only *essential* to the *reformation* of offenders, but also to the *discipline of a prison*.

As it is our object in discussing this act to confine ourselves to its effects on Catholics, in the two points (1) of awarding them more than a proper measure of punishment, and (2) of depriving them of that moral and religious instruction which is declared essential for their reformation and for due discipline, we shall not go into any of the clauses of the act which do not bear on these two points. And before going into any examination of the clauses, it may be well to observe that the clearest possible expression of any intention in a preamble will not do away with the effect of any positive enactment. Thus, if parliament were to express the most benevolent intentions towards, say, the Jews, and were thereupon to enact that they should be transported, one and all, after having had their teeth drawn, the Jews would be transported and tortured under the enactment, and the benevolent intention would go to the wall, or it would be held that parliament thought the penalties inflicted good for them.

Now all the sections of the act which bear in any way on our subject are the following :

1. As part of the tenth it is enacted, that prisoners sentenced to hard labour shall be exempt from it on Sundays, Christmas-day, and Good Friday ; that prayers selected from the Liturgy of the Church of England by the chaplain shall be read at least every morning, and that portions of the Scripture shall be read to the prisoners when assembled for instruction ; and that convicted prisoners shall attend divine service on Sundays, and on other days when it is performed, unless excused.

2. The twenty-eighth section enacts that the justices shall appoint a chaplain, who shall be a clergyman of the Church of England.

3. The twenty-ninth requires that such clergyman shall obtain a license from his Bishop.

4. The thirtieth requires the chaplain to perform morning and evening service on Sundays, Christmas-day, and Good Friday, and to preach as he may be required by rules

made under the provisions of the act; to catechise and instruct prisoners willing to receive instruction; to visit the prison and perform such other duties as may be required of him by the rules; to administer Holy Communion to prisoners desirous of communicating, and whom he may judge fit; to visit frequently every room or cell occupied by prisoners, and to direct the distribution and reading of such books as he may judge proper for the moral and religious instruction of prisoners confined therein; to visit prisoners in solitary confinement, and particularly to visit convicts under order for execution;—"and he shall have free access to all persons convicted of murder, any law, statute, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding; except to such persons as shall be of a religious persuasion different from that of the Established Church, who shall have made a request that a minister of such persuasion shall be allowed to visit them;"—to communicate to the justices any impropriety or abuse which may come to his knowledge; and to keep a journal, in which he shall enter the times of his attendance, and any observations which may occur to him in the performance of his duty.

5. The thirty-first section enacts: "That if any prisoner shall be of a religious persuasion differing from that of the Established Church, a minister of such persuasion, at the special request of such prisoner, shall be allowed to visit him or her at proper and reasonable times, under such restrictions imposed by the visiting justices as shall guard against the introduction of improper persons, and as shall prevent improper communications."

6. And, lastly, the forty-ninth section requires that a convenient chapel shall be provided in every prison, for divine service, and for the occasional moral and religious instruction of the prisoners.

When the sections of an act are not in accord with the expressed intention of the preamble, it need perhaps occasion no surprise that they should exhibit some curious and incomprehensible feats amongst themselves. If it were not for this, we should think there was something surprising about the thirtieth section. The chaplain is particularly to visit all convicts under order for execution, and he is also to have free access to all prisoners convicted of murder (whether under order for execution or not), except to such persons as are of a religious persuasion different from that of the Established Church who shall have made a request to be visited by a minister of their own persuasion. If, then, a prisoner is under order for execution for any crime but murder (and it must be remembered that the act is dated in the year 1823),

he is not to have the privilege of immunity from the visits of the chaplain; whilst if he is under *conviction* for murder, whether he be ordered for execution or not, the section protects him from the chaplain, but does not provide any other religious instruction for him whatever. But this is only by the way, and as a peg on which to hang the observation that parliamentary bills which have passed through their second reading and committal should, for the credit of the Legislature, have their patchwork reduced to shape and consistency before being presented to the House for their third reading. Many absurdities, unintelligibilities, and even contradictions, would be thus avoided. In government bills it is presumed that this is done by the law-officers of the crown; yet we can remember more than one instance of results of the enacting parts of a bill which were not only never intended by parliament, but contrary to its intention.

Let us now follow the act in its operations on Catholic prisoners.

The act says that its object is to insure to each prisoner a proper measure of punishment,—and by “proper” no doubt is meant just and equal,—so that no prisoner shall escape the due measure of punishment intended by law, and that no one shall receive more.

The act does not say that its object is to provide moral and religious instruction for prisoners; but it says that such instruction is essential to discipline and reformation, and puts this necessity forward as a motive for the changes effected by the act.

Now as respects Catholic prisoners, the act is a failure on both points, and introduces a machinery which must result either in proselytising the Catholic prisoner, or in punishing him more severely than if he were a Protestant, and in cutting him off from moral and religious instruction, or, in the most favourable cases, in leaving him to obtain an inadequate supply.

If it were not for the exceptions in the act relating to prisoners of a religious persuasion different from that of the Establishment, the absurdities of the act might be got rid of by supposing that the Legislature meant by “religious and moral instruction” such instruction of that kind as could be afforded by the clergy of the Establishment: but this interpretation is altogether excluded by the exceptions in favour of prisoners whose religious persuasion differs from that of the Establishment; for it cannot be contended that it was the intention of parliament that these persons should not be supplied with an article *essential*, not only to their reforma-

tion, but to good discipline within the walls of the gaol. On the other hand, the most liberal interpretation of the act will not go beyond a permission to Catholic prisoners to receive the instructions of a priest if he can get them, and will in no case provide for *supplying* him with such instructions.

Let us follow a Catholic into prison, and observe his treatment; and this will lead us to distinguish those parts which are necessary consequences of the law, and those which have grown out of its administration.

There are three classes of prisons in England: firstly, county, city, or district prisons; secondly, prisons established under separate acts of parliament, and excluded from the operations of the act under review; thirdly, military prisons. We speak now of the first class only.

When a Catholic enters such a prison, he is asked to what religious denomination he belongs, and if he answers that he is a Catholic, or a Roman Catholic, the effect of his answer is registered against his name. This registration of his creed is made under the rules of the prison, not under any express provision of the act. We are unable to say whether the rules of all prisons under the act require this registration, but we believe that they do. It is, however, morally certain that many Catholic prisoners, by their own fault or that of the authorities, are entered as Protestants.

There is but one printed return of the numbers of prisoners of various denominations in confinement at any one time. In 1853, the late Frederick Lucas moved and carried an address for a "Return showing in each prison in the United Kingdom, on the 25th day of September 1852, the number of prisoners of each religious denomination; the names of the clergymen, or other religious instructors, appointed or officiating in each prison during the previous year to promote the reformation of the prisoners of each denomination through the instrumentality of their own respective creeds; the religious denomination to which each such clergyman or religious instructor belongs; the salary or allowance made to him during the year, distinguishing the sums applied for this purpose out of the money voted by parliament from those derived from county-rate, county-cess, or other local sources; the title, office, or service, in virtue of which such salary or allowance has been made; and the date of the appointment of each such clergyman or religious instructor, or of the commencement of his allowance, if an annual one." This return now lies before us, and shows, as respects the number of prisoners registered as professing one creed or another, the following result:

*Number of prisoners of each religious denomination on the 25th  
September 1852, viz.*

|                                   |        |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Church of England . . . .         | 16,077 |
| Presbyterian . . . .              | 496    |
| Dissenters (all classes) . . .    | 1,391  |
| Roman Catholics . . . .           | 2,955  |
| Jews . . . .                      | 45     |
| Described as of no religion . .   | 323    |
| Not stated of what denomination . | 339    |
| <hr/>                             |        |
| Total . . . .                     | 21,626 |

These results may be perhaps usefully put in the following form, which exhibits out of 1000 prisoners the proportional number belonging to each of the above classes :

|                                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| Church of England . . . .         | 743  |
| Presbyterian . . . .              | 23   |
| Dissenters (all classes) . . .    | 64   |
| Roman Catholics . . . .           | 137  |
| Jews . . . .                      | 2    |
| Described as of no religion . .   | 15   |
| Not stated of what denomination . | 16   |
| <hr/>                             |      |
| Total . . . .                     | 1000 |

We thus see, assuming that the returns are correct, and that the number of Catholic prisoners confined on one day will not sensibly differ from the average in confinement one day with another throughout the year, that there may be expected to be 2955 Catholics in confinement at any one time.

But it is certain, on closer inspection of the returns, that this number is an under-statement.

Thus, in the county gaol of Chelmsford, out of 1464 prisoners in confinement, only 17 are returned as Catholics. The number, to correspond with the average, should be 200. In Newgate no creed-register appears to be kept, and the religion of none of the 122 prisoners in confinement is distinguished. There would probably be about 24 Catholics confined. In Portland prison only 40 prisoners out of 829 are set down as Catholics; whereas we believe that nearly one half of the prisoners, this being a military prison, were Catholics. Newgate and Portland, however, not being county prisons, do not come within the scope of our examination.

The inaccuracy of the returns may also be inferred from

the enormous preponderance of prisoners set down as belonging to the Established Church. It is incredible to suppose that 743 persons out of every 1000 in confinement are in any sense whatever members of the Establishment. There are no published statistics which enable us to infer the number of Catholics who are subject to prison-discipline in the course of a year from the number in prison on any one day. This number would depend on two unknown quantities; viz. the average duration of imprisonment, and the number of committals during one year of the same person. The population of our gaols is not taken out of the whole population, but the prisons have their *habitués*, and some persons make them their residence many times in the same year.

We shall have again to recur to this question of numbers when we come to another part of our subject. We have allowed ourselves this digression to bring palpably before the mind of the reader the *magnitude* of the question. It is only a reasonable guess if we venture to suppose that about 20,000 Catholics annually pass through the process we are about to describe in our county prisons.

Our Catholic prisoner, having had his religion registered, passes from the amenities of the lodge to his cell. He finds here a copy of the rules of the prison; and one of these rules allows him to object to attend Protestant prayers and services, and to request the attendance of a minister of his own denomination or religious persuasion. And here Catholic prisoners divide themselves into two classes: the one, who *desire* to amend, and, as a means thereto, to receive instruction and the Sacraments; the other, who would prefer an interview with any one in preference to the priest. We need not say that these latter are by far the larger class,—that they have no objection to attend any services whatever which will afford them some relaxation from labour or solitary confinement, and that they make no request to see a priest, but listen with hardened and impudent effrontery to the instruction offered by the Protestant chaplain; or perhaps receive gladly his attacks on their faith, in the hope of staying the cravings for better things which would lead them to repentance and the Sacraments; or perhaps with quiet humour note the more salient points which afford the opportunity of a good story to be told outside; or perhaps, particularly if this is not their first appearance within the walls of a prison, play with cunning talent on the zeal of the parson, profess grave doubts as to whether they should ever have been there if they had known him earlier, and had sooner had their eyes opened to the tricks of the priests.



But the other class—those who desire to amend, and, as a means thereto, to receive instruction and the Sacraments—are naturally divided again into two classes: those who have the courage, energy, and firmness to carry out their desires; and the timid and procrastinating. The latter intend to do what is necessary, but never in fact succeed in mustering strength to do it. They attend the Protestant prayers and services with an unquiet conscience, and listen with bewilderment to the private instructions of the Protestant chaplain. They are perhaps attracted by his kindness, perhaps dominated by his stronger will and energy. Their convictions become shaken, some perhaps become a sort of Protestant, whilst his daily influence keeps them from confessing their faith, and holds them to the acknowledgments they have been surprised into making. They come out of prison less able to cope with temptation, and with little or no faith. They have lost something, but have got nothing instead of it.

Let us next attempt to trace the action of the law, and the rules which have grown out of it, on those who have the courage, energy, and firmness to carry out their desire to have the ministrations of a priest, and to get the help of the Sacraments. First and foremost, they will claim their right as Catholics to absent themselves from Protestant prayers and services. But the assembling of the prisoners for prayers and religious services is precisely that time when, more than at any other, they require all the supervision of all the authorities. It is the well-known and recognised time at which all the ingenuity and vigilance of the administration cannot succeed in preventing a system of communication between the prisoners, which, more than any thing, tends to destroy the discipline of the prison, and to impede the reformation of offenders. The boldest and most ingenious thief and burglar, the oldest hand, the man who is paying his twentieth visit to the gaol, and is able to impart the traditions he has learnt, takes the lead. A code of signals, perfected by the ingenuity of ingenious men, is soon established. It is even said that burglaries are planned, and it is certain that the rendezvous outside is communicated and agreed on, and that gangs are thus recruited.

The consequence of this to the Catholic absentee is, that he must be locked up in his cell; and the fact is, that he is locked up in his cell during the whole time of Protestant prayers and services, whilst the worse disposed of his fellow-prisoners are really enjoying themselves and completing their education, and whilst the better disposed are at

least receiving some relaxation from forced and unwilling labour or from solitary confinement. Let us see what this extra punishment really amounts to, and for this purpose let us take the case of a prisoner who is sentenced to three months' confinement.

In all gaols, for aught we know, but certainly in all considerable ones, the morning and evening prayers of the Church of England, or at least a selection from them, are read. This will relegate the Catholic absentee to about one hour's solitary confinement on all days except Sundays. Taking three months at ninety-one days, including Sundays, here are seventy-eight hours' (excluding Sundays) more solitary confinement than is inflicted on the Protestant or lax Catholic; seventy-eight hours is about four days (rather more), counting the day at sixteen hours; for we throw overboard the eight hours during which all prisoners are asleep in their beds, and which are not hours of punishment. Then there are the Sundays, with two full services, taking up about three hours each Sunday. As there are thirteen Sundays, this makes thirty-nine hours, or about two days and a half, extra solitary confinement to which the Catholic absentee is practically sentenced. He gets as nearly as possible one week's more solitary confinement during his three months' imprisonment than is inflicted on a Protestant or lax Catholic.

But he has the right to request the attendance of a Catholic priest. Before we consider the effect and value of this privilege, let us observe that, quite independently of any direct effect on the morals of prisoners, it would greatly facilitate the discipline and good order of a prison if Catholic prisoners were provided with Catholic services. The Catholic and Protestant services would naturally follow one the other; and thus the prisoners would be divided into two large and distinct classes, each of which could be better supervised than the much larger number of both Protestants and Catholics who now attend the only services provided. Take Tothill Fields Prison, or Westminster House of Correction, as it is called. In the parliamentary return we have indicated, it is stated that on the 25th September 1852 there were 766 prisoners in confinement; of these 412 were members of the Established Church, 302 were Catholics, 42 were Dissenters, 2 were Presbyterians, and 2 were Jews. It would be much more possible to keep good watch during the hours of divine service on two or three separate bodies of 412, 302, and 44 each, than on one body of 766, less the very few persons who claimed the privilege of absence, and incurred the extra

punishment for conscience' sake. This is well known to and acknowledged by the governors of more than one of our largest prisons, who do not hesitate to admit, though they desire that such opinions should not be reported to their immediate superiors the visiting justices, that the separation of prisoners for divine service would very greatly assist them in maintaining discipline and preventing improper communications. And here, perhaps, we may also forestall an objection to providing Catholic services and Catholic religious instruction to Catholic prisoners which the instance quoted may suggest. It will perhaps be said, If we grant you Catholic services and chaplains, may not every class of Dissenters claim the same? How many chaplains do you want? We answer—

1. That Protestant Dissenters do not object to attend the services of the Church of England, and that their clergy and unimprisoned fellow-laymen do not object for them; that they are not taught, and do not in fact believe, that there is any sin in joining such services, whilst the contrary is the case with Catholics; and that it is no answer to any complaint founded on admitted principles and actually preferred, to say that some other people, who do not in fact do so, might complain if equal privileges were not conferred on them, or if equal justice were not done them.

2. That if it were required, or if it were thought to be expedient, to do so, it would be not only possible but easy to appoint a third or even a fourth chaplain to a gaol to meet the supposed wants of Presbyterians and Dissenters. If any one doubts this, the simple and sufficient answer is ready: *It has been done in Ireland*, and has been found to work admirably.

3. That the claim of Catholics is immeasurably stronger, on all grounds but those of principle, than any other religious body can advance. We are out of all comparison a more numerous body, and our religion is entitled to this political consideration—that it is the original religion of the country, the preponderating religion in Ireland and Canada, and that it is that of nearly one-third of the Queen's Christian subjects, of nearly half the army, and of about one-fourth of the officers and seamen of the fleet.

We may illustrate the magnitude of our claim, as founded on comparative numbers, by the following selection from the parliamentary return already quoted. We shall confine our examples to county and district prisons, which will exclude many in which Catholic prisoners exist in large numbers:

|                                           | No. of members of<br>Established Church. | No. of<br>Catholics. |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| County Gaol, Chester . . . . .            | 74                                       | 36                   |
| Knutsford House of Correction . . . . .   | 194                                      | 116                  |
| Derby County and Borough Gaol . . . . .   | 120                                      | 17                   |
| Devon County Gaol . . . . .               | 126                                      | 15                   |
| Hants County Gaol . . . . .               | 202                                      | 19                   |
| Kent County Prisons . . . . .             | 321                                      | 56                   |
| Lancaster Castle . . . . .                | 39                                       | 16                   |
| Kirkdale Gaol . . . . .                   | 213                                      | 173                  |
| Liverpool Borough Gaol . . . . .          | 421                                      | 333                  |
| Preston House of Correction . . . . .     | 219                                      | 65                   |
| Salford New Bailey Prison . . . . .       | 332                                      | 161                  |
| Leicester County Gaol . . . . .           | 147                                      | 21                   |
| Bridewell Hospital* . . . . .             | 30                                       | 10                   |
| Coldbath Fields . . . . .                 | 911                                      | 214                  |
| Westminster House of Correction . . . . . | 412                                      | 302                  |
| County Gaol, Morpeth . . . . .            | 29                                       | 19                   |
| Newcastle-upon-Tyne . . . . .             | 83                                       | 34                   |
| Nottingham County Gaol . . . . .          | 26                                       | 8                    |
| Ipswich House of Correction . . . . .     | 53                                       | 29                   |
| „ Borough Gaol . . . . .                  | 10                                       | 5                    |
| Horsemonger Lane Gaol . . . . .           | 39                                       | 13                   |
| Wandsworth House of Correction . . . . .  | 466                                      | 99                   |
| Warwick County Gaol . . . . .             | 156                                      | 17                   |
| Worcester County Gaol . . . . .           | 169                                      | 19                   |
| Beverley House of Correction . . . . .    | 60                                       | 21                   |
| Hull Gaol . . . . .                       | 89                                       | 28                   |
| Wakefield House of Correction . . . . .   | 397                                      | 111                  |
| Totals . . . . .                          | 5338                                     | 1957                 |

We have purposely introduced into this list several cases in which the *proportion* of Catholics is small, as is ordinarily the case in inland and agricultural districts.

Here, then, are 5338 Protestants and 1957 Catholics confined in 27 gaols. The Protestants are supplied with religious instruction in these gaols at an annual cost of 8044*l.*;† the Catholics are totally unprovided for.

Let us compare the treatment of these 1957 Catholics in these 27 gaols with that of the 137 Protestant Dissenters scattered over the 42 county and city prisons in Ireland.‡ In each of these prisons there are necessarily two chaplains, one Catholic and one Church of England (and Ireland !); there

\* We believe this to be under a separate act of parliament.

† The salaries of the chaplains at Coldbath Fields Prison are not given in the return. We have supposed them to be the same as in Westminster House of Correction, viz. 600*l.* per annum, but we are informed that they are 750*l.*

‡ These figures are taken from a similar parliamentary return for Ireland as we have already quoted with respect to England.

is besides a Protestant dissenting chaplain wherever there are any Protestant dissenting prisoners. As a matter of fact, there are seventeen such chaplains, and the annual cost is 576*l.* 13*s.* 5*d.*, or about 42*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.* per head. It is always more rateably costly to provide for the instruction of small than of large numbers, but we observe by the way that one-tenth of this cost per head would amply provide for all the spiritual wants of Catholic prisoners in England.

But we must return after this long, but not we hope unimportant or useless, digression to the case of our conscientious Catholic prisoner, who, as we have found, is condemned to one week's solitary confinement over and above the punishment intended to be awarded to him. If, absenting himself from the Protestant services, he is desirous of other religious instruction, he has the opportunity once a week of asking for it. Once a week the assembled prisoners are publicly asked if any of them desire the assistance of a minister of their own "denomination or religious persuasion ;"\* and if any Catholic prisoner answers affirmatively, his name is taken down. In some of our best regulated prisons, information of this request is immediately, or as soon as can well be done, transmitted to the nearest Catholic chapel ; in fact, some governors, finding the good effect of the visits of the priest, are only too glad to get his services. In other cases, and this in large prisons too, where there are many Catholics, although few, as may well be supposed under such a system, are desirous of solitary confinement and the occasional visit of a priest, no notice is taken of the request until a certain number of such requests have accumulated. Two or three weeks sometimes elapse before the neighbouring priest hears of the request of the Catholic prisoner to see him. Before he sees him the man's firmness may well have been expended. He has been brought to acknowledge to the governor and the chaplain that he is not bigoted, and that he really likes the Protestant services very much, and, which is very likely true, that he sees no harm in them, and wonders why his priest should object to them. The fair interpretation of the act would, we have no doubt, require that when a prisoner has once requested to see a priest, the latter should have free access to him at all reasonable times, —in fact, at all such times as the Protestant chaplain has

\* This phrase has been objected to as unintelligible to an uneducated Catholic, who, it has been said, will not know his own religion to be either a "denomination" or "persuasion." In one of our large London prisons the phrase was altered, by the authority of the visiting justices, into one in which the word "Roman Catholic" was introduced. This alteration was, however, distasteful to the Protestant governors and the more bigoted of the Justice Shallows, and the form which had been objected to was reinstated.

access to prisoners in their cells. But in most cases the rule of the prison is, that for each visit there must be a special request. This is visiting-justice law, and has been held to be good on appeal to the Home Office. In some few more favourable cases greater latitude of access is, by the indulgence of the authorities, allowed to the priest; but he is in no case allowed to visit a Catholic prisoner who has not taken the unpopular and exceptional step of asking for him. He is, then, excluded from the most hardened offenders; and he is so hampered in his communications with others, and they suffer so many inconveniences and privations by following his instructions, that he has but little chance of being of much use to them.

We see, then, that the practices which have grown up under the enactments of the statute practically deprive all Catholic prisoners of the religious and moral instruction which the preamble of the act declares to be essential to discipline and reformation.

A very delicate and a somewhat difficult question here arises: Are such practices necessary deductions from the act? and if not, would other rules and a more just and liberal interpretation of the act meet the intention of the Legislature, the justice of the case, and the necessary requirements of Catholic prisoners?

In answer to this we must make at first sight a somewhat dangerous acknowledgment, viz. that there is what we believe to be a wider and better construction of the act which would greatly mend the position of those prisoners who make use of the option now offered them of absenting themselves from Protestant services, and who request the attendance of their own clergy. The rule or practice of one visit only for each request, of asking the prisoners only once a week whether they require the attendance of a clergyman of some other denomination than that of the Established Church, of putting the question in a form unintelligible to many of the prisoners, and of punishing those prisoners who absent themselves from the Protestant services with solitary confinement, is not a necessary deduction from the act, is not called for by its letter, but is rather repugnant to its whole spirit, whilst it is contrary to the declared intention of its preamble.

The danger of the admission is this: that if we show that a better state of things is obtainable under the act as it stands, we may be asked, and too many of us might be disposed, to accept possible ameliorations which after all would leave a wide, and, as we believe, an intolerable, margin of spiritual destitution outside the improvements made and, at least temporarily, accepted.

We entertain no doubt that the rule of allowing only one visit for each one request is against even the letter of the act, and that it would be in conformity with its spirit and intention to give the priest the same free access to Catholic prisoners as the Protestant chaplain has to all prisoners.

The thirty-first section says that, if any prisoner shall be of a religious persuasion differing from that of the Establishment, a minister of such persuasion shall, at the special request of the prisoner, be allowed to *visit him*, not once only for each request, but “at proper and reasonable times,” and this, subject only to such restrictions as the visiting justices may impose, not for the purpose of restricting the amount of instruction or the number of the visits, but with the view of preventing the “introduction of *improper persons*,” and the making of “*improper communications*.”

Even supposing, though we cannot see how such an interpretation will at all hold water, that the rule of one visit for each one request were a necessary deduction from the words of the act, however contrary to the spirit and meaning of the preamble, it is certain that the question might be asked daily instead of weekly.

Again, as the act declares moral and religious instruction to be essential, not only to reformation, but to discipline, and yet allows prisoners to choose from what denomination they will receive such instruction, it follows reasonably, if not necessarily, that the *same amount* of this “essential” commodity shall be given to those prisoners who receive it from a Catholic priest as to those who receive it from the Protestant chaplain. And hence, it may also be argued, it also follows that, if a prisoner is excluded from Protestant daily prayers and Sunday services, he should have the benefit of the prayers and services of his own denomination, *if he can get them*; *i. e.* if any clergyman of his denomination will supply them. This interpretation of the statute has, we are informed, been actually adopted in some large prisons where Catholics abound.

In point of fact, we have no reasonable doubt that a construction of the law might be adopted which would reduce the grievances we should have to complain of to the following:

*First*, that Catholic prisoners, unless they make a special request to see a priest, which they are not at all likely to do, are entirely deprived of instruction in their own faith, and are unable to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, and that thus they and the community at large are damnified; for *they* have not the same chance of reformation as other prisoners, and *the community* lose the advantage of a better discipline within the walls of the prison,

and run the imminent risk of suffering further losses from the ill conduct of the prisoner when he is discharged, and of being again chargeable with the expense of imprisoning him.

*Secondly*, that, at the best, those prisoners who desire the ministrations of a priest are not *supplied* with them, but are left to obtain them from his charity; and that if they get the necessary instruction, services, and Sacraments, this is done at the expense of people who, having already paid their county or other rate chargeable with the expenses of a prison, should not be called on to contribute further.

But there is another very great and fundamental objection to basing any hopes of amelioration on obtaining a better and fairer application of the act itself: it is that each prison is governed by its own rules, which are made by the justices, and, when approved by the Secretary of State, are binding on all parties; that the rules we complain of are now actually in force, and that to obtain any alteration or amendment it would be necessary that the justices should themselves originate them, for it is they that have the power of origination, whilst the power of the Secretary of State is confined to approval. Parliamentary enactment, and that only, can introduce uniform and beneficial arrangements amongst so many scattered, and for the most part unwilling, and often bigoted, authorities.

The Court of Queen's Bench could of course be brought to bear on them, and a *mandamus* might perhaps be got, requiring any specific justices to make rules in accordance with what might be successfully shown to be the meaning of the act. But we suppose that a separate *mandamus* must be got for each prison; and even if what we believe to be the utmost success obtainable under the provisions of the act as they stand were actually obtained, we should still require an alteration of the law to meet the two grievances which we have shown would remain.

The one only operative cure for the existing state of things is to carry out the preamble of the bill, to follow the precedents already set in the army, in the parliamentary education grant, and in the very apposite case of reformatories,—to treat Catholic and Protestant alike, and to provide Catholic chaplains for the instruction and reformation of Catholic prisoners.

The rock ahead of the movement in favour of Catholic prisoners, which, in its more public phase, was inaugurated by the great meeting which was held last year at St. James's Hall, Piccadilly, is, that those persons into whose hands the settlement with the Government of a plan of relief may fall, may rest content with amelioration short of equal dealing



with Catholic and Protestant prisoners, with Catholic and Protestant ratepayers, and with Catholic priests and Protestant clergymen, on points not affecting the endowments of the Establishment.

It is a principle capable of other application than to gaols, that the public good requires that if, for any reason, whether poverty or crime, men are sequestered, and subjected to discipline which deprives them of the power of looking after and providing for their own wants, those wants shall be supplied for them. This principle is admitted and applied with respect to bodily sustenance; it is admitted and applied with respect to the religious wants of Protestant prisoners and paupers; but it is not recognised with respect to Catholic prisoners and paupers. The first damage is borne by the unhappy individuals who are thus prejudiced, but the mischief recoils on the community.

---

#### THE NEGRO RACE AND ITS DESTINY.

BEFORE quitting the consideration of the Negro as he appears in his native seats, we have still a few words to devote to his

*Political institutions.* The orientalism which is so conspicuous a feature in all the social relations of Negroland attaches also to the type of government there exhibited. Except in Liberia, which is a democratic republic, faithfully copied from the pattern of the United States, despotic monarchy is the political form which society spontaneously assumes over the whole of Negroland. Formerly, when Mohammedan enthusiasm was fresher and fiercer, extensive kingdoms were established, which swallowed up for a time most of the minor states into which Negroland is now parcelled out. Such were the kingdoms of Melli, Songhay, and Bornu, the last-named of which has been gradually decaying ever since the sixteenth century, and cannot now muster a twentieth part of the armed force which the sultans of that age could summon around them. In the absence of standing armies, aristocracies, regular public revenues, and easy means of transit, it is scarcely possible for a large Negro state, even if once established, to continue long in being. Commanding individual genius or religious fanaticism may cement or fuse together in a temporary union a number of communities before independent; but there are disintegrating causes constantly at work which tend to reduce states so formed to such

moderate dimensions as are manageable by mediocrity and not too tempting to ambition. Among the numerous petty sovereigns of these states, whom conflicting interests dissociate, and to whom the opportunity of a good "take" of slaves by a raid into a neighbour's territory is at all times too tempting to be missed, mutual war is the normal condition of things. The state of war generates insecurity both in fact and in feeling; and insecurity precludes the improvement of agriculture, stops the development of commerce, and, generally, makes all advance in civilisation impossible. Hence it would appear that the great political desideratum for Negroland at present is the formation, under European auspices, either by raising up new chieftains or aggrandising the old, of two or three large and solidly-established kingdoms, capable of assuring to their inhabitants the blessings of internal peace.

We have now arrived at the second portion of our inquiry, that which has reference to the condition of the Negro section of the population in the various communities of European origin whither he has been transplanted. With the exception of the Mauritius, the Seychelles, Réunion, Java, and the Portuguese settlements in Africa, these communities are all found in America and the islands adjacent. The colonies of northern and Protestant nations shall first be surveyed, and afterwards those of southern and Catholic nations.

In the Danish West-Indian islands the treatment of the Negroes, though formerly inhuman, was gradually ameliorated by home legislation, until in 1848 all the slaves were emancipated. The Danish missionaries have laboured actively during a long series of years, so that at the present time nearly the entire Negro population of their colonies professes Lutheranism.

In the Dutch colonies (Guiana, Curaçao, and one or two other small islands) the condition of the Negroes up to the end of the last century was one of great hardship. Many cases of revolting cruelty on the part of masters are on record. The mortality among the slaves was very great. But ever since the beginning of the present century milder treatment has been encouraged by the government, and partially enforced by the laws. In 1851 a code of regulations as to the diet, clothing, lodging, protection, and punishment of the slaves came into operation, the provisions of which are so humane, that if enforced they leave little to be desired. No provision, however, is mentioned, giving facilities for manumission. Dr. Waitz pertinently asks, "Is it the moral im-

provement of the Negroes or of the Dutch which has rendered this milder legislation possible? Or is it the English emancipation, and the fear of risings among the slaves, which extort humanity from the masters? and how much of these legal provisions is really executed, how much evaded?"

The condition of the Negroes in England's colonial possessions has ranged, during the three centuries which have elapsed since she first entered the African slave-market, between the extremes of an iron hopeless bondage and of a lazy *dolce-far-niente* independence. And in truth, the pendulum has seldom stopped, scarcely even lingered, at any intermediate stage; the Negroes have been either overtaken and ill-used drudges, or chartered libertines; and in the West Indies they have found either a house of bondage or a land of Cockayne. Dr. Waitz, on the authority of Sir James Stephen, asserts (p. 285) that "the state of the slaves in the English West Indies was essentially worse than that of the slaves in the colonies of other nations, of the slaves in the ancient world, and among the Germanic peoples in the middle ages." It is needless to repeat a thrice-told tale of stripes, tortures, and blood-hounds; more especially as, however such stories may be multiplied and authenticated, the difficulty remains of determining the *proportion* which the cases of cruel bear to those of humane treatment in the colonies where they occur, and to similar acts of barbarity in the colonies of other nations. It is enough to consider that one circumstance, the presence of which more than any other relieves, while its absence peculiarly aggravates, the bitterness of slavery, namely, the possibility to the slave of obtaining freedom. Is his lot hopeless? is he debarred from the prospect of a brighter future? In this respect the law and practice in our colonies were both detestable. "Emancipation was impeded by onerous imposts, which yet in the course of the eighteenth century were generally raised; the slaves could not buy their own freedom." Consequently the freed negroes were few in number in the first instance, while the restrictions on their freedom were iniquitous and degrading. "The courts of law interpreted the act of manumission by the owner as nothing more than an abandonment or release of his own proper authority over the person of the slave, which did not, and could not, convey to the object of his bounty the civil and political rights of a natural-born subject."\* In explanation of this general assertion, the writer states that the evidence of no free coloured person was received in criminal cases against a white; that no such

\* See Bryan Edwards' *History of the West Indies*, vol. ii. p. 18.

person could hold the most insignificant office of public trust, even that of a constable; nor vote at any election, nor inherit property above the amount of 2000*l*. Further, the marriages of slaves had no legal efficacy, and no sort of connection was recognised between them and the land they cultivated. "After labouring for a few years," says Bryan Edwards, "a good Negro gets comfortably established, has built himself a house, obtained a wife, and begins to see a young family rising about him. His provision-ground, the creation of his own industry, and the staff of his existence, affords him not only support, but the means even of adding something to the mere necessities of life. In this situation, he is seized on by the sheriff's officer, forcibly separated from his wife and children, dragged to public auction, purchased by a stranger, and perhaps sent to terminate his miserable existence in the mines of Mexico." The writer adds that this is no rare case, like instances of alleged extraordinary cruelty; "unhappily it occurs every day, and under the present system will continue to occur."

At the time that Bryan Edwards wrote (1792), the philanthropic party in England had begun to agitate for the abolition of the slave-trade, and were presenting petitions to Parliament with that end in view. Edwards, a humane man, and well acquainted from personal observation with the state and wants of the colonies, was strongly opposed to immediate abolition. He pointed out that, from various causes,—of which the principal were the disproportion between males and females in the whole number of imported Negroes, the practice of polygamy among the slaves in the colonies themselves, and the general degradation of their condition,—the slave population, far from keeping up or adding to its numbers by natural increase, required to be constantly recruited by fresh importations from Africa, in order to keep pace in any degree with the demands of the labour-market; that the plantations were even then under-stocked; and that to cut off the only source of labour open to the planters, was to consign them to certain ruin. He added, what was undoubtedly true, that many of the soul-moving pictures drawn by the abolitionists were absurdly overcharged, since three-fourths of the Negroes conveyed in the slavers were already in a condition of slavery in Africa, and a very large proportion had been slaves from birth. But when he stated that they exchanged a harsher for a milder form of slavery, although doubtless he believed it to be so, he made an assertion which, as we have already seen, was contrary to fact.

The whole question was placed upon its only right basis

by the clearest and most capacious intellect then existing in the British islands—by Edmund Burke. That great man, in his *Sketch of a Negro Code*, sent with a letter to Secretary Dundas, in 1792, while he embodied all the provisions which the experience of all ages and nations has shown to be the most effectual, both for mitigating the evils of slavery while it exists, and for gradually extinguishing it in the ratio of the progressive culture of the slave, avoided all those sweeping measures, ruinous to the master and morally injurious to the slave, into which an exaggerated sentimentality was hurrying the philanthropists. He proposed, firstly, that various measures should be adopted with the view of regulating the trade in Negroes; such as restrictions on the class of Negroes selected at the marts, on the number per ton conveyed in each slaver, and on the dietary, &c. during the voyage. Secondly, that after their arrival in the colonies their condition should, so far as possible, be permanently elevated by imperial enactments, establishing Negro-protectors in every district, giving to the slave the right to buy his freedom at a fair valuation, encouraging and recognising their marriages, forbidding the separation of families, and so attaching them to the soil, like the *adscripti glebæ* of antiquity, or the serfs of modern Russia, that they could not be sold off the plantations on which they were born without their own consent. Substantially, it was the slave-code of Spain and Portugal which Mr. Burke desired to induce the British Parliament and people to accept. Of that code the spirit, principles, and salient features were due to the influence of the Catholic Church, and are precisely those which, without social convulsion, and with the least possible injury, moral or material, to individuals, succeeded in gradually extinguishing slavery in Europe. Under that code slavery is either extinct or is fast dying out in South America, and is in continual process of extinction in Cuba; although there, as we shall presently show, the interference of the civil law, and the continued importation of slaves from Africa, tend to retard and qualify the natural elevating effects of the code.

But one of the evils of that system of party government which necessarily prevails in a constitutional country, is that it is far more difficult to carry a wise measure than a brilliant one, to legislate conformably to permanent reason rather than at the dictate of some temporary interest. A paternal government, if but moderately enlightened, will generally legislate in the best and most rational manner to meet any given exigency, because it knows that the most effectual way of keeping the subjects satisfied with things as they are,

is to make all social arrangements so rational and equitable as to leave them no ground of serious complaint; whereas a government which represents a party consults primarily the interest of that party, and is generally contented if it can legislate so as to secure popularity, or at least avoid raising an outcry. It thus happened that between the two opposing parties Burke's proposal fell to the ground. The West-Indian party, too confident in their present strength, rejected it because it interfered in favour of the Negro too much; the Abolitionists, because it interfered too little. The Government, counting votes, not reasons, did nothing as long as the planters could command a majority in Parliament, and gave up every thing as soon as the Abolitionists succeeded, through the fierce excitement which they stirred up in the country, in bringing round that majority to their side.

In 1807 the slave-trade was abolished, and in 1811 made punishable by transportation. The planters had made good use of their time while the struggle was pending; for whereas the total number of slaves in the West Indies in 1792 is estimated by Bryan Edwards at about 430,000, the total number at the date of emancipation (1834) was about 720,000, a number which\* was certainly less than the aggregate of the slave population in 1811. Yet no sooner was the trade abolished than the economical difficulties predicted by Bryan Edwards made their appearance. Even while it lasted the plantations, from the causes already stated, were under-stocked; and after it had ceased the pressure grew annually more severe. Owing chiefly to the inequality of the sexes, the Negro population in most of the islands, being now unrecruited from abroad, gradually declined in number, and the decline brought with it stationary or diminished production, together with increased toil and hardship to the slave. For it is easy to see that, if the work of a plantation could be just kept under, without over-driving, by one hundred Negroes, the reduction of that number to ninety must result either in a diminution of production to the extent of ten per cent, or in the exaction, by cruelty and "driving," of the same amount of work from a diminished number of hands. The only way of providing against the decrease of the labouring population,—apart from the questionable expedient, always of doubtful efficacy, of importing free coolie or Chinese labour,—would have been for those islands in which the sexes were most equally distributed to devote themselves to rearing slaves for sale in the other islands; just as Virginia and Maryland breed Negroes for exportation to Alabama or Tennessee. Probably some-

\* See *Ed. Rev.* for April 1839.

thing of the kind was attempted; if so, the attempt was quashed by the Act of 1823, prohibiting the inter-colonial slave-trade. Such a trade, if allowed at all, should certainly have been placed under most stringent regulations. Yet it seems both inconsistent and oppressive, in a legislature which at the very time permitted the unrestricted sale of Negroes in the *home-market* of each colony,—which allowed of the separation of families, and denied to the slave the right of purchasing himself free,—to prohibit, on the plea of *humanity*, a series of operations of which the result would have been, by increasing the supply of labour, to make more easy the position of the labourers. Encumbered by mortgages and charges of various kinds, under which it could barely bring a profit to the owner even in prosperous times, West-Indian property, now that an adequate supply of labour was no longer obtainable, gradually deteriorated and became a source of anxiety, if not loss, to its possessors. Emancipation, therefore, in 1834, did but put the planters out of their pain at once; it was the finishing stroke to a process of gradual impoverishment which had been going on for years.

“This English Negro-emancipation,” observes Dr. Waitz, “will remain to all time as one of the most stupendous moral, economical, and political follies which the history of human culture has to point to. A multitude of thoroughly uncultivated men, torn from their native country, compelled by the lash to work only for others, whose intelligence had been purposely repressed, ill-used in various ways, and habituated to every species of vice, particularly to sloth,—is suddenly released from its servitude in order, for the future, to behave as a nation of mature self-governing men. If, during several generations, the laws had secured to them two free days in the week on which to labour for their own benefit, and had given them the right and the opportunity of buying themselves free, then at least a large proportion of them would have become fond of labour. Had they been kindly treated, or, at any rate, not trampled upon; had efforts been made to develop their intelligence by education, and their moral sense by religion; had they been placed in such a position that their own interest might appear to go hand in hand with that of their masters, or not to run wholly counter to it,—then this great measure might at least have been acquitted from the reproach of utter irrationality.”

Concerning the condition of the Negroes since emancipation, the accounts vary greatly. The anti-slavery party, in their exultation that the Negro can no longer be whipped, however idle he may be, are too ready to wink at the frailties of their *protégé*, and to believe that he is making rapid

strides in civilisation. On the other hand, the economists, as well as the sterner moralists, are perhaps too prone to regard the experiment as a total failure. The truth seems to be that, though the cost of the experiment was needlessly extravagant, both morally and materially; though the economical structure of West Indian society has been subverted past renewal, and an entire generation of Negroes has been rendered good for nothing by the gift of a liberty for which they were not prepared,—yet the natural good effects of freedom are at last beginning to show themselves. In the first place, the Negro population, which before emancipation was decreasing, has since that time been steadily on the increase;\* and the “beautiful black peasantry,” whose licensed laziness moved the spleen of Mr. Carlyle, have, it would appear, even in the larger islands,—partly from the increasing population, which begins to press upon the means of subsistence, partly from their having acquired a taste for European clothing and other luxuries,—shown of late some inclination to go to work again. In Barbadoes, indeed, and others of the smaller islands, the density of the population is such as to compel the Negro to work hard for wages. In Jamaica the chief result of emancipation has been, that the planters, finding that the land could no longer be cultivated, have taken to selling it. Within eight years after emancipation, 100,000 acres of land had been purchased in fee by Negroes; and as the process has since gone on, probably in an increased ratio, there seems reason to believe that the greater part of the soil of the island, which does not amount to 3,000,000 acres altogether, will pass before many years into the hands of black or coloured proprietors. A large number of these peasant proprietors, according to the report of a Jamaica magistrate in 1853, owned horses, pigs, and poultry, and drove a brisk trade in their farm-produce. In 1850 Bigelow found ten or twelve coloured members in the Jamaica House of Assembly, and noticed that the old prejudice against African blood was fast disappearing.

*United States.*—The condition of the Negroes in the United States, as to which so many conflicting statements perplex the world, can here be only described in general terms. In the fifteen slave-holding states of the Union there are nearly four millions of slaves. Each state being independent and sovereign in its internal affairs, the slave-codes of the different States present certain variations; but the com-

\* See Edin. Rev. *ubi supra*.



mon interest which binds them all together is so strong that in the main American slavery wears a uniform aspect. The general rule is, that the manumission of slaves is systematically discouraged. Whereas in Cuba one Negro in every four is free, in the American slave-states the proportion of free blacks is only as one in nine. Nowhere has the Negro the legal right to buy himself free. In some states, as South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, free Negroes are considered "offensive,"\* and are not permitted to emigrate to or remain in the state. A master in any one of those states who emancipates a slave is punished by a heavy fine, and the slave is sold by public auction for the benefit of the state. It is illegal also to teach a slave to read and write; any person attempting it is subject to a fine of thirty dollars for each offence. Nowhere does the law place the smallest restriction on the separation of families at sales. We might say much more, and after having described the law, might illustrate its working by examples; but the reader who has followed us thus far will be perfectly able to draw the necessary conclusions for himself. He will see that with such laws, however kindly and indulgently the slaves may be treated on many plantations, their condition is approximated to that of animals rather than to that of men. For the first time in the world, a system of slavery has been organised on a large scale which cuts off from the slave all hope of raising himself to freedom. For the first time it has been gravely avowed, to quote the words of an American judge,† that "the end of slavery is the profit of the master, his security, and the public safety;" and that "the slave, to remain a slave,‡ must be made sensible that there is no appeal from his master; that the master's power is in no instance usurped, but is conferred by the law of man at least, if not by the law of God." We cannot wonder, such being their laws, that American writers have invented a physiological theory to justify them, and have charged the Negro with a radical incapacity and irrationality, disqualifying them permanently for freedom; a charge of which Dr. Waitz's treatise, from the first page to the last, forms one continued refutation.

It may be asked, how do the slaves fare in those states which, from being colonies of Catholic nations, have become

\* Slavery in the United States. Longmans, 1866.

† Ibid. p. 54.

‡ This assertion, by the way, is palpably false; for both among many African nations and in Catholic communities, the power of the master over the slave is restricted in many ways, yet the slave remains to all intents and purposes a slave.

incorporated in the American Union, viz. Louisiana and Florida? With regard to Florida, we have no precise information. In Louisiana, according to the unimpeachable testimony of Mr. Olmsted, the condition of the slaves is much better than in Virginia, and *a fortiori* than in the Carolinas or Alabama. He was informed\* by a Virginian slave-holder, that in Louisiana the slaves were more intelligent and treated with more familiarity by the whites than in Virginia; that in consequence there was more amalgamation between the races; besides, he added, "the laws in Louisiana were much more favourable to them." Afterwards, upon visiting Louisiana, Mr. Olmsted found that some miles above New Orleans there was a large number of free coloured planters settled along both banks of the river, who, being descended from French or Spanish masters and Negro women, had, by the old laws of the country, as they stood before annexation to the Union, inherited the condition of free men. He noticed also, apparently to his great astonishment, that in the cathedral at New Orleans, the white and black worshippers mingled together indiscriminately and knelt to pray side by side.

The condition of the Negro in the colonies founded by Catholic nations must now be examined. After noticing in order the present colonial possessions of France, Spain, and Portugal, we shall turn our attention to the communities, now independent, which were originally founded by those nations respectively.

*French Colonies.*—Negroes were first introduced into the French Antilles in the sixteenth century. In Guadaloupe, the largest of the islands, there were in 1841, out of an aggregate population of 131,162 persons, 93,558 slaves against 37,604 whites and free people of colour. The famous *Code Noir*, first promulgated under Louis XIV. in 1683, while it contained many humane provisions relating to the food, clothing, and instruction of the slaves, and distinctly forbade the separation of families at sales, precluded them, on the other hand, from the right of holding any private property, or of giving valid testimony in a court of law, and condemned the offspring of a white and a female slave always to follow the condition of the mother. There seems reason to believe† that the humanity of these regulations remained to a great extent in the state of theory and benevolent intention, and that the lot of the slaves under French masters, although better on the whole than in the English colonies,

\* Olmsted's *Slave States*, p. 108.

† Waitz, p. 294.

was generally a hard one. Of late years, the treatment is said to have become extremely mild: the slaves were allowed to accumulate private property;\* were attached to the soil which they cultivated, so that they could not be sold off their own plantations; and could not be compelled to work more than a stated number of hours. In consequence, it would seem, of these preparative measures, emancipation, which came in 1848, had not the disturbing effects which attended it in the English colonies. After a brief crisis, the slaves quietly went to work as free labourers for wages, and the production of sugar has not fallen off, has even in some islands been increased.

*Spanish Colonies.*—Cuba and Porto Rico, the remnants of the once magnificent dominion of Spain in the New World, are in themselves possessions of no contemptible value. The material progress of Cuba in the last thirty years has been very great. An English traveller,† writing in 1850, comments on the remarkable contrast which the state of Jamaica in that year presented to that of Cuba, the one all languor and decay, the other all industry and vitality. The population, according to the most probable estimate,‡ amounted in 1859 to about 1,500,000 souls, of whom 700,000 were whites, 200,000 free black and coloured persons, and 600,000 slaves. The old Spanish laws, so admirably mild and wise, are still in force; but their power for good has been latterly abridged, in proportion as the dignity and social weight of the Church, which, as in Spain, has been stripped of nearly the whole of its property, have declined. Among the provisions designed for the protection and benefit of the slaves while in slavery, the following are the chief:—Slaves married by the Church cannot be separated against their will. On Sundays and holidays the slave is entitled to his full time for his own benefit, with the exception of two hours for necessary labour on the plantations. No master is allowed to inflict upon his sole authority a punishment exceeding twenty-five lashes. Again, the law decisively favours emancipation. Every slave has a right to go to a magistrate and get himself valued, and on paying his valuation to receive his free papers. He is allowed to pay the amount by instalments. He can also compel his owner to transfer him to another master at the price at which he has been valued. Many slaves are skilled in some trade or handicraft; a circumstance which of course

\* Waitz, p. 295.

† Hill's *Peru and Mexico*, 1860.

‡ Dana's *To Cuba and back*, 1859.

greatly enhances their value to a master; but the law permits no addition to be made to their valuation on this account beyond the sum of one hundred dollars. A slave-mother may enfranchise her infant at the font by the payment of twenty-five dollars. Lastly, the Negro, after he has won his freedom, does not, as in the southern states of the Union, find himself a member of a degraded class, nor under the ban of a rigorous social exclusion. On the contrary,\* in all civil privileges and before the law, the free black is the equal of the white; and his social position is "quite as good as in New England, if not better."

On the other hand, the excellent law which orders that every slave be baptised, religiously brought up, instructed in the Christian doctrine, and receive Christian burial, if it was ever executed at all, has at least in later times fallen into desuetude. The slaves are all baptised, and all receive Christian burial; but between the cradle and the grave little care is said to be taken of their Christian education. In the towns the state of things is somewhat better; but very few of the slaves on the plantations (we still quote Mr. Dana) attend Mass or receive any religious instruction whatever. Again, the present civil law of Cuba† contains the iniquitous enactment, that no marriage shall be valid between a white and a person having any tinge of black blood. There is in consequence a vast amount of concubinage. Such a life the Church of course will not sanction, but requires the parties either to marry or to separate. Marriage, however, being interdicted by the local law, separation is practically the only course open; and it is easy to understand that few can so rise above human frailty as to make up their minds to this; hence they keep aloof from the Church and the Sacraments. Lastly, through the want of Christian instruction, the Negro, the sensual bent of whose nature we have already commented upon, is impatient of the restrictions of Christian marriage, and actually prefers in most cases a mock union performed by the master to a marriage solemnised by the Church.

It is well known that for some years back a large number of slaves has been annually imported into Cuba from Africa. Taylor, an authority already quoted,‡ declares that a marvellous improvement takes place in the appearance and manner of these Africans after a brief sojourn in Cuba. Speaking of some Negroes whom he had seen landed from a slaver, and who were then so wild, filthy, and unintelligent as to seem scarcely human, he asserts that the steady rule of a kind

\* Dana, p. 218. † Ibid. p. 214. ‡ See *Rambler*, part viii. p. 179.

master so changed them for the better, that after an interval of two years they were hardly recognisable. The comparison, however, would have been more valuable had it been instituted between the Cuban slave and the African *before*, instead of *after*, the middle passage.

Of the state of the Negroes in Porto Rico, Dr. Waitz gives us no detailed information, merely saying that the slaves form but one-ninth of the population. By returns made in 1836, the white population was estimated at about 188,000, the free people of colour at 131,000, and the slaves at 41,000; total, 360,000.\* These proportions strikingly show how infallibly the Spanish laws tend to extinguish slavery, in the absence of continued importation. It would appear that during a long series of years no slaves have been imported into Porto Rico. But if a newspaper-paragraph which we lately noticed can be relied upon, a fresh importation has recently been commenced, *viâ* Cuba.

*Portuguese Colonies.*—The colonial possessions of Portugal, confined at the present day with trifling exceptions to Africa, are to be regarded rather as commercial stations than as colonies, since the climate is too oppressive even for the Portuguese constitution to thrive and multiply in. The number of slaves and of coloured people is insignificant, because the number of resident whites has always been so. Several tribes in the neighbourhood of the Congo River and around St. Paul de Loanda have been converted by Portuguese missionaries; but of late years the zeal for propagating the faith would appear to have languished. Yet the Portuguese influence, as is evident from the testimony of Dr. Livingstone, has penetrated deeply and efficaciously into the interior; and if another sovereign like John III., other governors like Albuquerque, other priests like Simon Vaz, were to be again given to Portugal, the conversion and civilisation of the whole native race of austro-central Africa, which, though not of the pure Negro type, is closely akin to it, may be not unreasonably hoped for.

*Hayti.*—This fine island was formerly divided between the French and Spaniards. But the effects of the French Revolution extended from the mother-country to the colony, and after a bloody war of races, the whole island achieved its independence. This result was in great part attributable to the genius of the black hero Toussaint l'Ouverture. After his treacherous capture and removal to France, the state of the island grew from bad to worse. It enjoyed, indeed, a few

\* *Gazetteer of the World*; Edinburgh, 1859.

years of good government (1822-1843) under President Boyer; but subsequently the old feud between Negroes and Mulattoes has been revived, and intestine warfare has become chronic. The Emperor Faustin Soulouque, a pure black, persecuted the coloured races with the greatest barbarity; but about two years ago he was driven into exile, and we have seen no accounts of the subsequent course of events. No white man is allowed to possess land in Hayti, or to enjoy the rights of citizenship. Christianity exists but in name, and the people have lapsed into their old belief in sorcery and witchcraft. The population is believed to be about one million. On the whole, the present condition of Hayti is a telling argument against the capacity of the Negro race to preserve and develop a social order without extraneous aid.

*Spanish America.*—According to the best computation which we can form from the materials at our disposal, the Negro population scattered over the independent states formed out of the old continental possessions of Spain in North and South America,—viz. Mexico, Central America, New Granada, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chili, La Plata, Paraguay, and Venezuela,—amounts to about 700,000 souls. Of these probably at least two-thirds are free, and the remainder are continually passing into freedom by operation of law. The following are among the testimonies which we have collected upon the condition of the Negro race in these beautiful countries. Our authority, where no other is stated, is the excellent *Gazetteer of the World* above referred to. In Central America the Negroes are all free, slavery having been declared illegal by an act of the federal government shortly after the separation from Spain. In Peru the constitution declares that all persons born in the republic subsequently to its passing are free, and that Negroes imported as slaves at once acquire their freedom. Of the 4000 slaves in Lima, Mr. Hill, in the work already quoted, says that “they are becoming by the law gradually free: they are commonly permitted to work for themselves several hours during the day, so that the industrious often save enough to buy their freedom; the amount, if the parties do not agree, being fixed by judges appointed by the law.” In Chili the Negroes “are treated with a degree of tenderness and humanity that greatly alleviates their servitude. A law has been passed declaring that no slave can henceforth be born in Chili, so that slavery may be regarded as virtually abolished in this fine country.” In La Plata there are found among the Mulattoes “professors and teachers of the liberal arts.” “The Negroes . . . are

treated with kindness and attention when sick, and never abandoned in old age. They are even said to be better fed and better dressed than the poorer classes of the whites; and many of them obtain their freedom after a short period of service." From Paraguay we have similar accounts. In Venezuela the slaves were all emancipated in 1854.

Brazil, once the humble satellite of Portugal, but now a mighty orb, in comparison with whose lustre the parent luminary is destined before long to "pale its ineffectual fire," seems to be in many respects the very Paradise of the Negro race. The slave-trade was effectually abolished by the imperial government in 1850, since which time the demands of the labour-market have been adequately kept under by immigration from Europe. Isolated instances of cruelty are still too common; but the law places freedom so completely within the Negro's reach, and treats him, when he has become free, with such absolute equity, that his condition on the whole is one eminently hopeful and cheering. Out of a population of 7,000,000, it is estimated that about 3,000,000 are slaves, and more than 2,000,000 free blacks or Mulattoes. In Southey's *History of Brazil* (vol. iii.) a detailed account may be found of the state of the Brazilian slaves some seventy years ago, particularly of those on the monastic estates. The same provisions respecting the slave's right of purchasing his freedom at a fixed valuation, manumission at the font, &c., which we have already met with in describing the Spanish code, were also enforced in Brazil by the laws of Portugal. Since the separation from the mother-country, the local legislature, to its eternal honour,—how far unlike the United States government!—has adopted in the fullest extent the same humane and Christian policy. Kidder, an American Bible-distributor, who visited Brazil in 1857, writes as follows: "In Brazil every thing is in favour of freedom, and such are the facilities for the slave to emancipate himself, and when emancipated, if he possess the proper qualifications, to ascend to higher eminences than those of a mere free black, that *fruit* will be written against slavery in this empire before another century rolls round. Some of the most intelligent and best educated men I met in Brazil were of African descent. With freedom and merit, no matter how black a man's skin, no place in society is refused him." Compare with this state of things the slave-system of Georgia or Alabama, under which free Negroes are deemed "offensive," and hunted out of the state!

The Negroes on the monastic estates in the province of

Pernambuco were never sold, never chastised with the whip. The sexes were equalised. They were required to work by the piece, and could easily finish the task assigned to them by three o'clock in the afternoon; the rest of the day was their own. Early marriages among the slaves were encouraged, and the children carefully instructed by the monks. A notion prevailed among them that they were in the service of St. Benedict himself, rather than in that of his living representatives. Our Lady of the Rosary (*Nuestra Senhora do Rosario*) was the special patroness of the Negroes in Brazil, and she was sometimes painted as a Negress.

We have now, with the aid of Dr. Waitz, completed the sketch which we proposed to give of the Negro race, both in its native and its adopted seats. A rough estimate of the entire Negro population all over the world gives the following result :

|                        | Free.      | Slaves.    | Total.     |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Africa . . . . .       | 13,000,000 | 39,000,000 | 52,000,000 |
| British Colonies . . . | 957,000    | . .        | 957,000    |
| Danish ditto . . . .   | 33,000     | . .        | 33,000     |
| Dutch ditto . . . . .  | 3,000      | 72,000     | 75,000     |
| United States . . . .  | 400,000    | 3,200,000  | 3,600,000  |
| French Colonies . . .  | 318,000    | . .        | 318,000    |
| Spanish ditto . . . .  | 250,000    | 640,000    | 890,000    |
| Hayti . . . . .        | 1,000,000  | . .        | 1,000,000  |
| Spanish America . . .  | 615,000    | 205,000    | 820,000    |
| Brazil . . . . .       | 2,000,000  | 3,000,000  | 5,000,000  |
| Total . . . . .        | 18,576,000 | 46,117,000 | 64,693,000 |

Comparing the civil condition of the Negro in Protestant and Catholic communities, we arrive at the following result, Hayti being excluded from the calculation :

|                        | Free.     | Bond.     | Proportion of free to bond. |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| Catholic Communities   | 3,183,000 | 3,845,000 | 1 to 1·208                  |
| Protestant Communities | 1,393,000 | 3,272,000 | 1 to 2·35                   |

That is, whereas in Catholic communities the number of free Negroes is nearly equal to the number of slaves, in Protestant



communities the slaves are more than two to one. Now it must be remembered that the Catholic Church does not pretend, like the Abolitionists of America and the pietists of Exeter Hall, to stigmatise the holding of one man in servitude by another as under all circumstances a sin. Yet it appears that in practice the Catholic system is more favourable to Negro freedom than the Protestant, very nearly in the ratio of two to one. Moreover, this proportion increases every year; for in Spanish America and Brazil slavery has a constant tendency to become extinct, while in the United States it has no such tendency.

We are now in a position to give some answer to the questions which were placed at the head of the first part of this article. To the question, Whence comes it that the Negro race is so easily enslaved? we may answer, that the principal cause is in the Negro himself. He is deficient in forethought, deficient also in after-thought; he neither takes precautions beforehand against the machinations which have his enslavement for their object, nor, after they have succeeded, and he is become a slave, does brooding reflection upon the evils of his condition distress his mind, and fill it with the desire of vengeance. Easily diverted, like a child, by external passing shows from the indulgence of inward feeling, he soon, if only he be well fed and allowed to amuse himself in his *play-hours* after his own fashion, becomes reconciled to a thralldom of which the iron would enter into and eat away a white man's soul. This, however, of itself would not account for the eagerness which the superior races have always shown to take Negroes for slaves in preference to the people of other inferior races. The ease with which he can be enslaved would signify little were his value as a labourer inconsiderable. But, on the contrary, his healthy constitution and robust frame enable him to accomplish in tropical climates, with cheerfulness and gaiety, an amount of hard work which would kill a white man, and greatly overtax the powers of a Hindoo. There are large districts of the world—such as the delta and lower valley of the Mississippi, the Antilles, and the southern slave-states of the Union—of which the productiveness could never have been fully developed without forced Negro-labour; and there are other large districts, such as the great basin of the Amazon and its tributaries, now lying in a state of nature and almost useless to man, of which it is difficult to conceive how the *exploitation* can ever be effected without the aid of the docile strong-limbed Negro race.

Must we, however, maintain with the Abolitionists, that, easy as it may be to reduce the Negro to slavery, the act is, and always has been, a crime against human nature and the Divine law? We cannot think so. The natural laziness and sensuality of the race would prevent the power of labour which is in it from ever being called forth, were they left to themselves; and to enslave the Negro, provided it be done under equitable conditions, which leave open to him the door of freedom as the reward of self-control, is in fact to place him under a course of training, which teaches and compels him to play that part in the world for which God and nature have evidently designed him. The case may be compared in many respects with that of the assignment of convicts as servants, a practice which went on for several years in our penal colonies. The condition of the assigned servant had about it many of the incidents of slavery: his master was bound to feed and clothe him, but paid him no wages; he could set him to any work he chose; and in case of his turning refractory, could get him flogged by order of the nearest magistrate. Yet we have no hesitation in saying,—and we speak from a considerable colonial experience,—that the moral operation of the assignment system in reforming and elevating the convicts submitted to it, was far more unmistakably beneficial than that of any of the many penal systems which have since been tried in its place.

We believe, then, that as a state of discipline and probation,—as a stage in its progress towards a higher level of culture,—slavery, under equitable conditions, is desirable for a large portion of the Negro race. For the animating principle of these conditions we cannot look elsewhere than to the Catholic Church, the supreme authority in moral and spiritual things on earth. It is not safe to leave the Negro to the unchecked control of individual owners; nor can statesmanship, even though it may frame just rules, be depended upon to provide adequately for their due execution. As the loving spirit of the spouse of Christ must dictate the conditions under which slavery may lawfully exist, so the watchfulness of her pastors is the only efficient check which can insure those conditions being faithfully observed. To enforce their observance upon all necessary occasions is the duty of the Christian state.

To give, then, a final as well as a formal cause for the phenomenon under consideration, the Negro is easily enslaved, because—provided always the society into which he is brought be Catholic—it is for his own good that he should

be so. Received under the sheltering ægis of the Church, whose establishment and free working, wherever they are permitted, are the reign of justice, truth, and charity on earth, the Negro feels himself, though called to be a bondman, yet "the freeman of the Lord;"\* and finds in the circumstances of his state that exterior support, that constant inner stimulus, to his moral being, without which he can seldom prevent himself from falling into the slough of indolence and sensuality natural to his race. He finds too that he need not give up the hope of raising himself even in this world, since his servitude is of a kind which looks *upwards*, and which it rests with himself, through his own persevering self-mastery, to exchange for freedom. But in a country where the authority of the Church over the conscience of the individual is disowned, it must be admitted that the Negro cannot safely be held in slavery. In such a country, as for example in the United States, either no check at all or no effectual check can be placed on the tyrannous and covetous propensities of masters; and slavery becomes in consequence, for the majority of the slaves, a brutalising and accursed state of life. In Protestant countries, therefore, good men feel by a true instinct that it is right to aim at a total abolition of slavery. For experience shows that the different Protestant sects can exercise no regulating moral influence antagonistic to the temporal interests of their lay members; and the Catholic Church—the only power which ever has, and ever will, "bear up against the world"—is by the nature of the case debarred from her rightful office of authoritative admonition, and has no determining voice in social arrangements.

To the second question, therefore, What is the nature of the prospect of a change for the better in the general condition of the race? we answer, that he who understands and would promote their true interests, will not be misled by the cry of Emancipation, but will steadily look to the introduction among these teeming millions of the faith and spirit of the Catholic Church, as to the only hope of permanent improvement, whether for the race or for individuals, and whether slavery be abolished or retained. And, as the ordinary human means by which this must be effected, he will look forward to the purification and extension of the influence of Catholic states throughout the countries occupied by the Negro.

Lastly, to the question, What is the ideal social state to be desired for the race? we should answer, Progressive

\* 1 Cor. vii 22.

training for the duties of freemen and the works of civilisation under the tutelage of superior races, being Catholic. In America the condition of freedom and that of slavery are alike compatible with the attainment of this end. Where some special circumstance, such as density of population causing a pressure on the means of subsistence, supplies the Negro with that external stimulus to industry which he requires, there, though he still needs the direction of the white man's more developed reason, it is neither necessary nor desirable that he should be enslaved. But in the absence of such circumstances, it is to be hoped that Catholic nations will not be deterred by the diatribes of the press, nor by the spurious thunder of Exeter Hall, from setting the Negro to work in that condition of regulated servitude without which, as a general rule, no work can be got out of him. Brazil will probably find it necessary to go again to Africa for labour, when she seriously takes in hand the settlement of the valley of the Amazon; and her doing so, provided she observe all the precautions which religion and humanity require, will be justifiable even upon the Benthamite maxim, that we should look to "the greatest good of the greatest number."

Upon the Negroes in Africa European influence must be exerted in two ways, in the sphere of morals and in the sphere of politics. Those who have studied the history of the conversion of nations, know how closely these two provinces of human action are related. While Portugal flourished and enlarged her dominion in the East, Christianity also made signal conquests; and but for the collapse of her power, Japan would not have lost the faith, nor Goa, once the centre of enlightenment and the holy city of the Indies, become a mournful heap of ruins and sepulchres. At the present day, France, in spite of infidelity and revolution, is the great missionary nation of the world. The French Church sends out into every land the heralds of the Gospel; and the French state, though not, alas, identifying herself with the faith which they preach, yet, regarding them as its citizens, sustains them energetically, and will not suffer their blood to be shed with impunity. France has already a firm hold upon Africa, and the best hope for the Negro race is that her ascendancy there may become yet more decisive. Already she is contemplating commercial treaties with the Tuaricks, the Berber inhabitants of the Great Desert; and the day is not far distant when French caravans from Algeria will be seen in the markets of Kano and Timbaktu. In the upper

valley of the Senegal her influence is steadily making way. In Abyssinia and the upper valley of the Nile, her missionaries and those of Austria are making many converts; and it seems not extravagant to hope that, through their influence, joined to the impression made by the exhibition of her power in chastising the infidels in Syria, the schismatic church of Abyssinia may be reattached ere long to the centre of Catholic unity. From east, west, and north, the paganism and brutality of Negroland are threatened with invasion. By encouraging the formation of large and powerful native kingdoms, Christian states may hope to put a stop to that interminable strife and confusion which now exist, and which make all advance in civilisation impossible; and by sending in the ministers of Christ, European and native, the Christian Church may hope gradually to raise the Negro race out of the depths of impurity and superstition in which they are plunged. When nations are found able and willing to do their duty, we may hope that the Lord of the harvest will send in fitting labourers. New Xaviers, new Clavers, will one day arise, to carry through central Africa the torch of faith:

“Alter erit tum Tiphys, et altera quæ vehat Argo  
• Delectos heroas.”

The lost Churches of Asia, those missing gems in the crown of the mighty Mother, will be replaced by new Churches in Africa, and in the fullness of time the primæval curse will be taken off from the sons of Ham.

---

## Communicated Articles.

### THE ANCIENT SAINTS.

#### CHAPTER V.

##### ST. CHRYSOSTOM.—THE DEATH.

WHENCE is this devotion to St. John Chrysostom, which leads me to dwell upon the thought of him, and makes me kindle at his name, when so many other great saints, as the year brings round their festivals, command indeed my veneration, but exert no personal claim upon my heart? Many holy men have died in exile, many holy men have been successful preachers; and what more can we write upon St. Chrysostom's monument than this, that he was eloquent and that he suffered persecution? He is not an Athanasius, expounding a sacred dogma with a luminousness which is almost an inspiration; nor is he Athanasius, again, in his romantic life-long adventures, in his sublime solitariness, in his ascendancy over all classes of men, in his series of triumphs over material force and civil tyranny. Nor, except by the contrast, does he remind us of that Ambrose who kept his ground obstinately in an imperial city, and fortified himself against the heresy of a court by the living rampart of a devoted population. Nor is he Gregory or Basil, rich in the literature and philosophy of Greece, and embellishing the Church with the spoils of heathenism. Again, he is not an Augustine, devoting long years to one masterpiece of thought, and laying, in successive controversies, the foundations of theology. Nor is he a Jerome, so dead to the world that he can imitate the point and wit of its writers without danger to himself or scandal to his brethren. He has not trampled upon heresy, nor smitten emperors, nor beautified the house or the service of God, nor knit together the portions of Christendom, nor founded a religious order, nor built up the framework of doctrine, nor expounded the science of the saints; yet I love him, as I love David or St. Paul.

How am I to account for it? It has not happened to me, as it might happen to many a man, that I have devoted time and toil to the study of his writings or of his history, and cry up that upon which I have made an outlay, or love what has become familiar to me. Cases may occur when our admiration for an author is only admiration of our own comments on him, and when our love of an old acquaintance is only our love of old times. For me, I have not written the life of Chrysostom,

nor translated his works, nor studied Scripture in his exposition, nor forged weapons of controversy out of his sayings or his doings. Nor is his eloquence of a kind to carry any one away who has ever so little knowledge of the oratory of Greece and Rome. It is not force of words, nor cogency of argument, nor harmony of composition, nor depth or richness of thought, which constitutes his power,—whence, then, has he this influence, so mysterious, yet so strong?

I consider St. Chrysostom's charm to lie in his intimate sympathy and compassionateness for the whole world, not only in its strength, but in its weakness; in the lively regard with which he views every thing that comes before him, taken in the concrete, both as made after its own kind and as gifted with a nature higher than its own. Not that any religious man, above all, not that any saint, could possibly contrive to abstract the love of the work from the love of its Maker, or could feel a tenderness for earth which did not spring from devotion to heaven; or as if he would not love every thing just in that degree in which the Creator loves it, and according to the measure of gifts which the Creator has bestowed upon it, and preëminently for the Creator's sake. But this is the characteristic of all saints; and I am speaking, not of what St. Chrysostom had in common with others, but what he had special to himself; and this specialty, I conceive, is the interest which he takes in all things, not so far as God has made them alike, but as He has made them different from each other. I speak of the discriminating affectionateness with which he accepts every one for what is personal in him and unlike others. I speak of his versatile recognition of men, one by one, for the sake of that portion of good, be it more or less, of a lower order or a higher, which has severally been lodged in them; his eager contemplation of the many things they do, effect, or produce, of all their great works, as nations or as states; nay, even as they are corrupted or disguised by evil, so far as that evil may in imagination be disjoined from their proper nature, or may be regarded as a mere material disorder apart from its formal character of guilt. I speak of the kindly spirit and the genial temper with which he looks round at all things which this wonderful world contains; of the graphic fidelity with which he notes them down upon the tablets of his mind, and of the promptitude and propriety with which he calls them up as arguments or illustrations in the course of his teaching as the occasion requires. Possessed though he be by the fire of divine charity, he has not lost one fibre, he does not drop one vibration, of the complicated whole of human sentiment and affection; like the miraculous bush in

the desert, which, for all the flame that wrapt it round, was not thereby consumed.

Such, in a transcendent perfection, was the gaze, as we may reverently suppose, with which the loving Father of all surveyed in eternity that universe even in its minutest details which He had decreed to create; such the loving pity with which He spoke the word when the due moment came, and began to mould the finite, as He created it, in His infinite hands; such the watchful solicitude with which He now keeps His catalogue of the innumerable birds of heaven, and counts day by day the very hairs of our head and the alternations of our breathing. Such, much more, is the awful contemplation with which He encompasses incessantly every one of those souls on whom He heaps His mercies here, in order to make them the intimate associates of His own eternity hereafter. And we too, in our measure, are bound to imitate Him in our exact and vivid apprehension of Himself and of His works. As to Himself, we love Him, not simply in His nature, but in His triple personality, lest we become mere pantheists. And so, again, we choose our patron saints, not for what they have in common with each other (else there could be no room for choice at all), but for what is peculiar to them severally. What is my warrant, therefore, for particular devotions at all, becomes my reason for devotion to St. John Chrysostom. In him I recognise a special pattern of that very gift of discrimination. He may indeed be said in some sense to have a devotion of his own for every one who comes across him,—for persons, ranks, classes, callings, societies, considered as divine works and the subjects of his good offices or good will.

It is this observant benevolence which gives to his exposition of Scripture its chief characteristic. He is known in ecclesiastical literature as the expounder, above all others, of its literal sense. Now in mystical comments the direct object which the writer sets before him is the Divine Author Himself of the written Word. Such a writer sees in Scripture, not so much the works of God, as His nature and attributes; the Teacher more than the definite teaching, or its human instruments, with their drifts and motives, their courses of thought, their circumstances and personal peculiarities. He loses the creature in the glory which surrounds the Creator. The problem before him is not what the inspired writer meant and why, but, out of the myriad of meanings present to the Infinite Being who inspired him, which it is that is most illustrative of that great Being's all-holy attributes and solemn dispositions. Thus, in the Psalter, he will drop David and



Israel and the Temple altogether, and will recognise nothing there but the shadows of those greater truths which remain for ever. Accordingly, the mystical comment will be of an objective character; whereas a writer who delights to ponder human nature and human affairs, to analyse the workings of the mind, and to contemplate what is subjective to it, is naturally drawn to investigate the sense of the sacred writer himself, who was the organ of the revelation, that is, the literal sense. Now, in the instance of St. Chrysostom, it so happens that literal exposition is the historical characteristic of the school in which he was brought up; so that if he commented on Scripture at all, he would have adopted that method; still, there have been many literal expositors, but only one Chrysostom. It is St. Chrysostom who is the charm of the method, not the method that is the charm of St. Chrysostom.

That charm lies, as I have said, in his habit and his power of throwing himself into the minds of others, and of imagining with exactness and with sympathy circumstances or scenes which were not before him. This is why his mode of writing is so peculiar, and why, when once a student enters into it, he will ever recognise it wherever he meets with it. I could not explain in a few sentences what I vividly feel; yet I will refer in illustration to two or three of his remarks on St. Matthew, as they stand in the *Aurea Catena*.

I turn, almost at hazard, to the beginning of the seventeenth chapter, in which the Transfiguration is related. Our Lord took three Apostles up into the mountain, six days after He had said, that some of those then present should not die before they had seen His glory. Now Remigius observes on this, that the Transfiguration is the fulfilment of this announcement. St. Jerome reconciles these six days with St. Luke's eight. Raban observes, that the six days stand for the six ages which precede the resurrection. Origen, that the six days carry us back to the six days of creation. But Chrysostom views them as illustrating our Lord's tenderness towards his half-trained Apostles; thus: "He does not take them up at once, but after six days, to avoid making the other disciples jealous," or that the three favoured disciples might by the delay "become kindled with a more eager desire."

Again; our Lord takes with him three Apostles, to signify, says St. Hilary, the three stocks of Sem, Cham, and Japhet;—"because many are called," says Raban, "and few chosen," and to remind of the Holy Trinity;—to show that those who seek God must mount up, says Remigius. But Chrysostom

is led from it to remark, "how St. Matthew does not conceal that three others were preferred to himself, just as John records the preëminent honour given by our Lord to Peter."

And so, again, as to the appearance of Moses and Elias in the glory, Origen says, that it denotes that there is a hidden Christian wisdom in the Law and the Prophets. Hilary, that the Israelites will be judged in the presence of those who preached to them. Jerome, that the Apostles gained what the Pharisees were refused, viz. Elias a sign from the heaven above, Moses a sign from the depth beneath, as the prophet proposed to Achaz. But Chrysostom gives, among other reasons, this, viz. that it was to comfort Peter and the others, who were so much frightened at the thought of His death, with the example of Moses and Elias, who had witnessed before tyrants, yet were now in glory.

"It is good for us to be here," &c. shows, says Remigius, that St. Peter, transported by the vision, wished to remain on the mountain for ever. St. Jerome says, "Thou art wrong, Peter; if thou must build them tabernacles, build for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and let their dwelling-place be, not on the mountain, but in thine own bosom." Raban observes that the Apostle was wrong in thinking there could be tabernacles in that abiding city, in which is no temple. But Chrysostom says, "Peter fears for Christ, when Moses and Elias speak of his death at Jerusalem; so, shunning a second rebuke, if he should say again, 'Lord, be it far from Thee!' he insinuates the same sentiment in the words, 'It is good to be here.'"

There are, comparatively speaking, few passages from the Saint in the Roman Breviary, as being a Greek Father; but such as are found there would supply fresh instances of what I have been pointing out. For instance, on the octave of St. John, he is led to observe, from the narrative in the Evangelist's 21st chapter, that as St. John had done a kindness to St. Peter, in once asking our Lord for his sake, at the last supper, a question which he dared not put himself, so, when our Lord had foretold Peter's coming history, Peter said, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" in order to repay him a good turn, by asking what St. John would be backward in proposing himself.

Again, on the octave of the Holy Innocents, he traces out the succession of alternating joys and sorrows which came upon St. Joseph. And so within the octave of Corpus Christi, when he is expounding the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, he throws his dogmatic statement into an ethical form, congenial to his own affectionate tone of thought. "Parents,"

he says, "often put out their children to suckle; but I, says Christ, am not such, for I feed you from Myself."

It was to be expected that such a man would have a special devotion to St. Paul; and I have incidentally instanced it in a former chapter. In the second Sunday after Epiphany he confesses it, and in language quite in keeping with the general cast of his mind. "When I listen to the reading of his Epistles," he says, "I am roused, and I kindle with my longing after him, recognising in him a voice dear to myself, and seeming to behold his very presence, and to hear him preach. And, if I know any thing about him, I know it, not from any talent peculiar to me, but because my abundant affection for him keeps me to the study of his writings; for those who love a man know more about him than others do, as having a solicitude for his person."

The loving scrutiny with which he followed the Apostles, he practised in various ways towards all men, living and dead, high and low, those whom he admires and those whom he weeps over. I mean, he writes as one who was ever looking out with sharp but kind eyes upon the world of men and their history; and hence he has always something to produce about them, new or old, to the purpose of his argument, whether from books or from the experience of life. Head and heart were full to overflowing with a stream of mingled "wine and milk," of rich vigorous thought and affectionate feeling. "What shall I do?" he cries out, in the midst of his comment on a passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (and to his comment on this Epistle I shall confine the instances I propose to give),—"What shall I do? I would fain be silent, but am not able. Come, rouse up, as if I were fresh beginning my discourse, and be as fresh yourselves in your attention. I would fain break it off, but it will not suffer me; just as a man in the midst of his draught cannot bear to interrupt it." And then, as soon as he has entered upon his new topic, he interrupts himself again. "Many thoughts," he says, "throng me all at once; I know not which to utter first, which next; therefore, let no one require order of me." And then he goes on to enlarge upon the glory of the Apostle as the "prisoner of the Lord:"

"Mighty is the power of God's chain! What would I not give for a sight of the Apostle bound and sitting in prison! Do you see the emperors, the consuls, borne aloft in their chariots, and arrayed in gold, and their body-guard all gold? their halberds of gold, their shields of gold, their raiment of gold, their horses with trappings of gold? I would rather see Paul once, going forth from the

other prisoners, than behold this parade ten thousand times over. How many angels, suppose ye, led the way before Him ?”\*

This is an illustration from the great ones of the earth ; but at another time he draws his lesson from the most degraded :

“A man is not so disfigured,” he says, “when stripped of his clothes as when stripped of his virtue. If you happen to see any one going bare through the public square, does not the sight annoy you ? Do not we pity those beggars, mountebanks as we call them ? At the same time we do not excuse them, if they have lost their clothes by gambling. How, then, as to ourselves ; if we lose the garment which God has given, will He pardon us ? Whenever the devil sees a man stripped of it, he at once bruises and blackens his face, and drives him into great straits.”

At another time he points to the pagan worship, which even then was to be seen around him, when he would denounce “covetousness, which is idolatry.”

“Thou slayest no sheep ; no, but thou slayest men. When thou passest by the idol’s altar here, thou shalt see it reeking with blood of bullocks and goats ; but pass by the altar of covetousness, and thou shalt find it breathing the shocking stench of human blood. There are no birds burning there, no steam, no smoke, but the bodies of men perish there ; for some cast themselves headlong, others hang themselves, others cut their throats. Wouldst thou see sacrifices more shocking still ? it is the souls of men lying slain in the other world. The slaughter of the soul is awful and terrific.”

Then, again, he would enforce seriousness of mind, and he appeals to the conduct of soldiers in camp or on campaign :

“Art thou laughing and jesting ? It is war-time ; and hast thou in thy hands the toys of dancers ? Look at the countenances of men in battle, their dark concentrated mien, their brow terrible and full of awe. Mark the stern eye, the heart eager, beating and throbbing, their spirit collected, trembling, and intensely anxious. All is good order, all is good discipline, all is silence in the camp ; they utter, I will not say, no impertinent word, but not so much as a whisper. Now if they who have visible enemies, and who are in nowise injured by words, yet observe so great silence, dost thou, who hast in words thy warfare, and the chief of thy warfare, dost thou leave this side of thee naked and exposed ? Art thou amusing and enjoying thyself, and speaking pleasantries, and raising a laugh, and regarding it all as a mere nothing ? How many perjuries, how many injuries, how many immodest speeches, have come of plea-

\* I use the Oxford translation of 1840, abridged and freely transcribed.

santries! It is a time of war now and of fighting, of watch and ward, of arming and arraying."

In like manner he enforces the duty of resignation to the will of God from what we witness in the manual arts. "Go to the carpenter's shop; thou dost not examine his reasons, though thou understandest not one of the things which are done there, and many things will appear to thee difficulties; as, for instance, when he hollows the wood, when he shapes it. Nay, still more, the painter. Does he not seem to be working at random? what do his lines mean, their turns and bendings? however, when he comes to put on the colours, the beauty of his art is brought out." He passes on to the instinct of animals: "But why do I speak of carpenters and painters? How does the bee frame her comb? Master the handiwork of the ant, spider, swallow, and then thou hast leave to speak about God also."

At another time he has recourse to the bee for a lesson of sweet temper, in a passage which reminds us of St. Francis de Sales:

"As bees will never settle down in an unclean vessel, and accordingly those who are skilled in these matters sprinkle the spot with perfumes, and scented oils, and burnt odours; and the wicker baskets also, in which they will have to settle as soon as they come out of the hives, with fragrant wines and all other sweets, that there may be no noisome smell to annoy them and drive them away again, so in truth is it with the Holy Spirit. Our soul is a sort of vessel or basket, capable of receiving the swarms of spiritual gifts; but if there shall be within it gall and bitterness, the swarms will fly away. Hence this blessed and wise Husbandman well and thoroughly cleanses our vessels, holding neither knife nor other instrument of iron, and invites us to this spiritual swarm; and as He gathers it, He cleanses us with prayers and labours and other observances."

He contrasts with this gentleness and good-humour that bitterness of nature of which gall or bile is the indication, and still with an illustration carefully worked out. This bitterness is "like some very fierce and frightful wild-beast, that has been brought into a city. As long as it is confined in its cage, however it may rage and roar, it can do no harm. But let its wrath get the better of it, and it break its bars, and contrive to leap out, it fills the city with all sorts of confusion and disturbance, and puts every one to flight." He gives an instance of it:

"Women, whenever they are angry with their maid-servants, fill the whole house with their noise. And often too, if the house is in a narrow street, then all the passers-by hear the mistress scolding

and the maid weeping and wailing. All the women round immediately look out at window, and ask, 'What's the matter?' 'It is so and so beating her maid.' What a shame! What is more base still, some are savage enough to lash them; they strip them, call in their husbands, and often tie them to the pallets. Alas! at that moment, tell me, does not the thought of hell come over you? What, strip your handmaid, and expose her to your husband! And then you threaten to put her in chains, having first taunted the poor creature with ten thousand reproachful names — witch, runaway, and the like. 'Ay,' say you, 'but they are a troublesome, audacious, impudent, incorrigible set. The whole tribe of slaves is incorrigible, if it meet with indulgence.' True, I know it myself; but there are other ways to keep them in order. You, who are a gentlewoman, have uttered foul words, and you disgrace yourself no less than her. Then, if she shall have occasion to go out to the bath, there are bruises on her back. If she is a believer, she is your sister. Are you not her keeper? has she not a soul as well as you? has she not been vouchsafed the same privileges? does she not partake of the same table? does she not share with you the same high birth? Now, some have come to such a height of indecency as to uncover the head, and to drag their maid-servants by the hair. Why do you all blush? I am not addressing myself to all, but to those who are carried away into such brutal conduct."

Elsewhere he compares the spirit of ambition and jealousy in the Church to a conflagration, and the passage is so striking, and so applicable to his own after experience at Constantinople, that, long as it is, I must ask permission to quote it:

"Ye have oftentimes been present at the burning of large houses. Ye have seen how the smoke keeps rising up to heaven; and if no one comes near to put a stop to the mischief, but every one keeps looking to himself, the flame spreads freely on and devours every thing. And oftentimes the whole city will stand round; they will stand round, indeed, as spectators of the evil, not to aid or assist. And then you may see them one and all standing round and doing nothing, each individual perhaps stretching out his hand and pointing out to some one who may be just come to the spot either a flaming brand that moment flying through a window, or beams and rafters hurled down, or the whole circuit of the walls forced out and tumbling violently to the ground. Many, too, there are of the more daring and venturesome sort who will have the hardihood even to come close to the very buildings themselves whilst they are burning, not in order so much as to stretch forth a hand towards them and to put a stop to the mischief, but only that they may be able to take a closer survey of all those things which usually escape the notice of those at a distance, and so may the more fully enjoy the sight. Then, if the house still further happen to be large and magnificent, they will look upon it as a pitiable spectacle, and de-

serving of many tears. And truly there is a pitiable spectacle for us to behold, capitals of columns crumbled to dust, and many columns themselves shattered to pieces ; some consumed by the fire, others thrown down often by the very hands which erected them, that they may not add fuel to the flame. Statues, again, which stood with so much gracefulness, with the ceiling resting upon them, these you may see all exposed, with the roof torn off, and themselves standing hideously disfigured in the open air. And why should one go on to describe the wealth stored up within ; the tissues and perfumes, and the caskets of costly jewels, all turned into one blazing pile, and within it now bathing-men, and beggars, and runaway slaves, and all who choose ; and every thing within one mass of fire and water, of mud and dust and half-burnt beams !

Now why have I drawn out so full a picture as this ? not simply because I wish to represent to you the conflagration of a house (for what concern is that of mine ?), but because I wish to set before your eyes as vividly as I can the calamities of the Church. For like a conflagration, a conflagration in very deed, or like a thunder-bolt hurled from on high, have they lighted upon the roof of the Church, and yet they rouse no one ; but whilst our Father's house is burning, we are slumbering on in a deep and stupid sleep. And yet who is there whom this fire does not touch ? which of the statues that stand in the Church ? for the Church is nothing else than a house built of the souls of us men. Now this house is not of equal honour throughout ; but of the stones which combine to form it, some are bright and shining, whilst others are smaller and more dull than they, and yet superior, again, to others. There we may see many who are in the place of gold also, the gold which adorns the ceiling. Others, again, we may see who give the beauty and gracefulness produced by statues. Many we may see standing like pillars, giving great gracefulness, not by their support only, but by their beauty also, and having their heads overlaid with gold. We may see a multitude forming generally the wide middle space and the whole extent of the circumference : for the body at large occupies the place of those stones of which the outer walls are built. Or rather, we must go on to a more splendid picture yet. This Church of which I speak is not built of these stones, such as we see around us, but of gold and silver and of precious stones ; and there is abundance of gold dispersed every where throughout it. But oh, the bitter tears this calls forth ! for all these things hath the lawless rule of vain-glory consumed ; that all-devouring flame, which no one has yet brought under. And we stand gazing in amazement at the flames, but no longer able to quench the evil ; or if we do quench it for a short time, yet, after two or three days, like a spark blown up from a heap of ashes, it will overturn all and consume all which it had not consumed before. Such, I say, is the case here ; and this is just what is wont to happen in such a conflagration. And the cause is this : The foundations of the very pillars of the Church have been lost to us ; those who supported the roof, and

who formerly held the whole building together, have been enveloped in the flame. Hence too was a ready communication to the rest of the outer walls ; for so also in the case of buildings, when the fire lays hold of the timbers, it is better armed for its attack upon the stones ; but when it has brought down the pillars and levelled them with the ground, nothing more is wanted to consume all the rest in the flames. For when the props and supports of the upper parts fall down, those parts also themselves will speedily enough follow them. Thus it is also at this moment with the Church ; the fire has taken hold on every part. We seek the honours which come from man, or burn for glory. We have forsaken the Lord, and are become slaves of honour. We are no longer able to rebuke those who are under our rule and guidance, because we ourselves are possessed of the same fever as they. We who are appointed by God to heal others need the physician ourselves."

This extract brings us to the history of his banishment, which I have left in order to enlarge upon the character of his mind and of his teaching. The evils which he thus denounced at Antioch came to a crisis at Constantinople, and he himself was the principal victim of them. His cause was that of the strict party in the Church, and the fire of envy and malice, of which he speaks, burst forth against him as its representative. For a time, in a city which boasted that it never had been pagan, the goodly fabric of Christianity was little better than a heap of ruins. The transportation of its saintly Bishop was the signal for a schism which it took years to heal ; and, worse still, it was a triumph of the secular party, which has never been reversed down to this day. In the present state of the Greek Church we read the moral of the conflict in which St. Chrysostom was engaged. Accordingly, there was much of significance in the coincidence, that, on the very day on which he was carried over to Asia, fire literally did break out in the cathedral, where he had so lately preached, and in his very pulpit. "There suddenly appeared," to use the words of Fleury, "a great flame in the church, from the pulpit from which he used to preach. The fire ascended to the roof, and then burst forth on the outside, so that it was burnt to the ground. The flames, driven by a violent wind, spanned the square like a bridge, seized upon the palace where the senate assembled, and burnt it down in three hours. The Catholics looked upon it as a miracle ; some accused the schismatical party of it ; they, and after them the pagans, imputed it to the Catholics." However originating, it typified the spiritual devastation of the Church of Constantinople.

The court party would perhaps give the catastrophe a



different application : they might see in it the fortunes of St. Chrysostom himself. Thus blazed and burnt out, they might say, the glories of that eloquent preacher, who had been so hastily brought to the imperial city. It was a great pity that he had ever left Antioch ; for what had he done since he came but create confusion in the Church ? No one denied his oratorical powers ; but he had neither discretion nor patience ; and, after two or three years, here was the end of it. As some brilliant meteor, he had glared and disappeared. He thought, forsooth, to get back from banishment ; but that never would be. His enemies were far too strong and too determined to allow of the chance of it. They were resolved utterly to blot out his name and his memory ; he would be written in the sand ; posterity would not know him, except as one who had caused great scandals, and had undergone the penalty of them.

Such anticipations, plausible as they were, have been falsified by the event ; the cause of truth and sanctity cannot utterly be defeated, however poor be the measure of justice which is accorded to it even on the long-run. The saint, however, was over-sanguine, as we have seen, in his anticipations of a contrary kind. He was at length, indeed, brought back in triumph to his see ; but he was brought back in his coffin. That first momentary presentiment, when he took leave of his deaconesses at Constantinople, was the true one. His earthly career was coming to an end. Here, then, we are come round to the point from which I have digressed, and I resume the narrative where I left off.

The reader may recollect that St. Chrysostom got to Cucusus in the autumn. His enemies seemed to have hoped that the winter would complete for them what they had begun ; he, on the contrary, looked forward to it with cheerfulness. Both parties were disappointed ; it did not kill him, but it inflicted on him great suffering ; it told most for his enemies, for they would infer that he could not possibly bear the recurrence of many such trials.

In the early spring of the following year (405) he wrote to Olympias thus :

“ I write to you after a recovery from the very gates of death ; on this account it was a great joy to me that your servants have not reached me till now, when I am getting into port ; for, had they come while I was still tossing out at sea, and shipping the heavy waves of my illness, it would not have been easy for me to deceive you with good tidings, when there could only be bad. The winter was more severe than usual, and brought on, what was

worse than itself, my stomach complaint; and for two whole months I was no better than the dead, or even worse. So far I lived as to be alive to the miseries that encompassed me; day, dawn, and noon, all were night to me; I was confined to my bed all day. With a thousand contrivances, I could not avoid the mischief which the cold did me; though I had a fire, and submitted to the oppressive smoke, and imprisoned myself in one room, and had coverings without number, and never ventured to pass the threshold, nevertheless I used to suffer in the most grievous way from continual vomitings, headache, disgust at food, and obstinate sleeplessness, through the long interminable nights. But I will not distress you longer with this account of my troubles; I am now rid of them all" (*Ep.* 6).

Later in the spring he reports that the marauding bands had again made their appearance.

*To Theodotus.*

"It was no slight relief in the desolateness of this place to be able to write frequently to you; but even this resource has been cut off by the circumstance of these Isaurian troubles. For, as soon as spring came, the brigands shot forth with it, and spread themselves out over all the roads, to the stoppage of all traffic. Free women were carried off and men slain. I know how anxious you are to know about my health. After serious suffering in the past winter, I am now somewhat getting round, though I am still distressed by the changes in the weather. Winter is in force even now; however, I look forward to be rid of the remains of my illness when summer is fairly come. Indeed, nothing so tries me as cold, nothing does me so much good as summer and the comfort of being warm" (*Ep.* 140).

In thus speaking hopefully of the approaching summer, he did but show his cheerful temper; for, when it actually came, he was forced to confess to some friends, "The summer distresses me not less than the cold" (*Ep.* 146). Earth and sea temper the sky for us, and keep the atmosphere in a due medium of heat and cold. But Chrysostom was in a desert country, which gave him no protection against weather of any kind, neither against the sun nor against the frost.

Yet his spirit did not sink under his disappointing experience of the climate, as the following letter shows:

*To Castor.*

"I know well it will be a great pleasure to you to learn how I fare. I am rid of my weakness of stomach; I am well; and, in spite of beleaguering, raids, loneliness, and a host of misfortunes, I am in no depression or trouble of mind, and am in the enjoyment of security, leisure, quiet, and keep your matters daily in my thoughts, and talk of them with all who visit me" (*Ep.* 130).

However, as autumn drew on, and his first year was completed, the face of things altered. Whether the barbarians were stronger, or the garrison at Cucusus had been weakened or removed ; whether it was some scheme of the saint's enemies to bring about a death which as yet they had not effected, so it was, that at the beginning of winter he was persuaded, or he found, that he was not safe at Cucusus ; the gates of the city were thrown open to him, and he was advised or obliged to leave it for the mountain region in the neighbourhood. Old as he was, enfeebled by recent illness, ignorant of the country and sensitive to the climate, and, as it would appear, without attendants, he had to face the wild winter as he best could, and to wander from village to village, according as the alarm of the Isaurians chased him to and fro. In this way he advanced at length to the distance of sixty miles from Cucusus, to a city called Arabissus. He knew the Bishop of this place, and it was professedly defended by a fortress, which at least served for its own defence. Into this fortress he threw himself ; it was a prison rather than a place of refuge, but at least it was secure ; and when he fell ill again of the cold there, he got some sort of medical aid, though medicines were not to be procured. At this time he writes as follows :

*To Nicolas.*

"Lately I have been flitting from place to place in the very depth of winter, now in towns, now in ravines and woods, driven to and fro by the inroads of the Isaurians. When this disturbance had at length abated a little, I left these desolate places, and betook myself to Arabissus ; not to the town, for that is as much unsafe as they are, but to the fortress, which, however, in spite of its being safer, was a worse dwelling than any prison. And, besides the imminent prospect of death day by day from the Isaurians, who were making their attacks in every direction, and destroying human beings and houses by fire and sword, I am in dread of famine too, from our want of resources, and the number who have taken refuge here. And I have had to endure a tedious illness, brought on by the winter and my incessant wanderings, and I still carry the remains of it, though I have recovered from its violence" (*Ep.* 69).

*To Polybius.*

"I lament your separation from me as a heavier trial than this desolateness, my illness, and the winter. The winter, indeed, has added to it ; for it has deprived me of that intercourse by letter, which was my sole relief of your most painful absence ; roads being blocked up by vast drifts of snow, and the passage interrupted, whether from the outward world hither, or from hence to you. And now the same obstruction is caused by fear of the Isaurians ; nay,

much greater, increasing the desolateness, putting into confusion, flight, and exile the whole population. No one any longer endures to remain at home ; all leave their dwellings and scamper off. The cities are but walls and roofs ; and the ravines and woods are cities. We, who dwell in Armenia, are obliged to run from place to place day after day, living the life of nomads and strollers, from fear to settle any where ; such confusion reigns. When the plunderers come up, they slaughter, burn, enslave ; when they are even rumoured, they put to flight the inhabitants of the cities, nay, I may say, murder them also ; for the young children, who have been suddenly forced to fly, as if smoked out of their houses, in the dead of night, often in hard frost, have needed no Isaurian sword, but have been frozen to death in the snow" (*Ep.* 127).

To another friend he says, "In whatever direction you go, you will see torrents of blood, heaps of corpses, houses demolished, cities sacked" (*Ep.* 68). He seems to have been besieged at Arabissus, from the following passage :

*To Theodotus.*

"The troubles of the siege increase daily, and here we are seated in this fort as in a trap. Just at midnight, when no one expected it, a band of three hundred Isaurians spread through the city, and were all but getting possession of me. However, the hand of God took them off again before I knew any thing about it, so that I escaped the alarm as well as the danger ; and, when day was come, then at last I heard what had chanced" (*Ep.* 133).

At length the storm blew over, and he was in comparative security, and he remained in the place for nearly the whole of his second year of exile (A.D. 406). He was able to employ himself in teaching the poor people, and he contrived, by means of the money sent him by friends, to relieve their wants when a famine set in. Before the year was over, he returned to Cucusus.

A third winter came, and brought its usual hardships along with it. We find the saint again weak and suffering at the beginning of A.D. 407 ; but by this time he was in some measure acclimated to the place, and he was able to express content at the state of his health.

*To Elpidius.*

"I have learned at last to bear the Armenian winter, with some suffering, indeed, such as may be expected in the instance of so feeble a frame, but still with real success. This is, by means of rigidly confining myself indoors when the cold is unbearable. As to the other seasons, I find them most pleasant and enjoyable, so as to enable me comfortably to recover from the illness brought on by the winter" (*Ep.* 142).

## And to Olympias :

" Do not be anxious on my account. It is true that the winter was what the season is in Armenia ; one need say no more ; but it has not done me any great harm, since I take great precautions against it. I keep up a constant fire, and have every part of my small room closed. I put on a great deal of clothing, and I never stir out. A few days ago, nothing would stay on my stomach, from the severity of the weather. I took, among other remedies, the medicine which Syncletium gave me, and, after using it, I got well by the end of three days. I had a second attack ; I used it again, and got completely well. Do not, then, make yourself anxious about my wintering here, for I feel much easier and better than I did last year" (*Ep.* 4).

It was at this date that he wrote to the same correspondent the striking letter, part of which I quoted in my foregoing chapter ; in which he confidently foretells his return from banishment, on the ground of his having been so wonderfully preserved hitherto, and enabled to triumph over the accumulated trials which bodily weakness, the seasons, and his wanderings and privations brought upon him. So hopefully for him, so unsatisfactorily for his enemies, opened the third year of his exile at the place which was to have been his death.

But the fairer were his prospects, the more certain was their disappointment. He was in their hands ; they had sentenced him to die, and only hesitated how his death was to be brought about. They had no wish to do the deed themselves, if it could be done without them ; but do it they must, if circumstances would not do it for them. Cucusus promised to spare them the odium of his murder ; and doubtless they would listen with complacency to the complaints about his discomforts and his ailments which from time to time he transmitted to Constantinople. It was easy to fancy them the tokens of a broken spirit, and the harbingers of the consummation they desired, when they were but his protests against injustice and cruelty, and the spontaneous relief of a soul too great to care about being misconceived. When time went on, and the end did not come, when even his wanderings in the mountains and his flight to Arabissus did not subdue him, they were prompted to more violent and summary dealings with him.

He must be carried off to some still more inhospitable region ; he must undergo the slow torture of a still more exhausting journey. Cold and heat, wind and rain, night-air, bad lodging, unwholesome water, long foot-marches, rough-paced mules,—these were to be the instruments of his martyrdom.

He was to die by inches ; want of sleep, want of rest, want of food and medicine, and the collapse which followed them, were to extinguish the brave spirit which hitherto had risen superior to all sorrows. A rescript was gained from the Emperor Arcadius, banishing him to Pityus upon the north-east coast of the Euxine.

In that sentence the curtain falls upon the history of the saint. His correspondence ceases ; the letter, so full of sunshine, to which I have several times referred, was apparently his last. He leaves us with the language of hope upon his lips. It is well that he should thus close the great drama, in which he was the chief actor. Bright, pleasant thoughts, nought but what is radiant, nought but what is enlivening and consolatory, attaches to the historical memory of St. Chrysostom. But the devout heart seeks to lift the veil ; it desires even amid the changes of mortality *notas audire et reddere voces* : it would fain be near to comfort him in his agony, and to hear his last cry.

It may not be ; when his letters would be most precious, they are, as I have said, denied to us. In the case of a saint, we are left to faith. It has been otherwise with others. There was a Protestant missionary, in the first years of this century, who, after attempting the conversion of a Mahometan country, was committed to the rough charge of a Tartar courier, not for exile, but for return to his own England. Hurried on by forced journeys, and having at the time a deadly malady upon him, he gradually sank under the cruel punishment, and breathed out his wearied spirit at the very spot which, 1400 years before, had witnessed the death of John Chrysostom. Let us trust that that zealous preacher came under the shadow of the Catholic doctor, that he touched the bones of Eliscus, and that, all errors forgiven, he lives to God through the intercession of the Confessor, to whom in place and manner of death he was united. The friends of Henry Martyn are in possession of his journal up to within ten days of his death ; for us, we must wait till we are admitted to the company of St. Chrysostom above, if such be our blessedness, before we know the last sufferings, the last thoughts, the prayers and consolations, the patience, sweetness, gentleness, and charity in his death, of that great mind.

Let us glean what we can from history and tradition of that last unknown journey.

First, we know that Pityus is on the very verge of the Roman empire, to the north of Colchis, close to Sarmatia, and under the Caucasus. It had been a large and rich city in an earlier century, and was situated in a region so peculiarly a

border country, that in Dioscurias, which lay south of it, as many as seventy languages or dialects were spoken. From that city it was distant about fifty miles, and Dioscurias was distant as much as 280 miles from Trapezus.\* This portion, however, of his journey was held in reserve for the Saint's destruction: he never got so far as Trapezus; and it concerns us more to consider how he travelled towards it. There were three routes from Cucusus thither; the most direct lay through Melitene and Satala; but this he certainly did not pursue, or he could not have died in the neighbourhood of Neocæsarea. To direct his course to Neocæsarea, he must have passed through Sebaste, and Sebaste he might reach by either of two routes,—by Cæsarea or by Melitene. Both of these were high military roads, and beyond Sebaste he might be helped on by another high road at least as far as Sebastopolis on the Lycus, which is either 365 or 330 miles from Cucusus, according to the route which was chosen for him. Thus we may say, that it took, more or less, 400 miles to kill him. The narrative which I shall presently transcribe says, that his journey lasted three months, which is hardly conceivable, unless he was detained from time to time by illness or other causes on the way.

So much for his route; next, as to the place of his death, we have historical information that he died at Comana in Pontus; and thence it was that his sacred body was conveyed some years afterwards to Constantinople.

Then, as to the day: Socrates tell us that it was the 14th of September, the day since set apart, in consequence of the events of later history, as the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross.

So far we can speak without hesitation; but when we set ourselves to trace the occurrences of his closing months, and the particulars of his journey, we find ourselves without any materials for the undertaking. We have neither public documents nor the private letters of himself or of his friends to assist us in the task. The narrative which commonly, and by great authorities, is received as authentic, is written by one of his contemporaries and friends; but he was no eye-witness of what he relates, nor does not tell us how he got possessed of it. However, I present it to the reader as it stands:

“The rescript,” said Palladius, “ordered that he should be transported to Pityus, a most wild place of the Tyanians, lying on the coast of the Euxine. And the Prætorian soldiers, who conveyed him, urged him forward on his journey with

\* Smith's Dictionary.

such haste, saying that it was according to their orders, that it appeared as if their promotion depended on his dying in the course of it. One, indeed, of them, having less solicitude for this earthly warfare, secretly showed him some sort of kindness; but the other carried his brutality so far as even to take as an affront the very attentions which were shown to himself by strangers, with the hope of softening him towards his prisoner, having this solicitude, and no other, that John should miserably die. So, when rain was profuse, the man went on, not caring for it, so that floods of water poured down the bishop's back and breast; and again, the fierce heat of the sun he considered a treat, as knowing that the bald head of blessed Eliseus would suffer from it. Moreover at city or village, where the refreshment of a bath was to be found, the wretch would not consent to stop for a moment.

"And all these sufferings the Saint endured for three months, travelling that most difficult way with the brightness of a star, baked red by the sun as fruit upon the top branches of a tree. And when they came to Comana, they passed through it as if its street were no more than a bridge, and halted outside the walls at the shrine, which is five or six miles in advance.

"In that very night the martyr of the place stood before him, Basiliscus by name, who had been Bishop of Comana, and died by martyrdom in Nicomedia, in the reign of Maximinus, together with Lucian of Bithynia, who had been a priest of Antioch. And he said, 'Be of good heart, brother John, for to-morrow we shall be together.' It is said that the martyr had already made the same announcement to the priest of the place: 'Prepare the place for brother John, for he is coming.' And John, believing the divine oracle, upon the morrow besought his guards to remain there until the fifth hour. They refused, and set forward; but when they had proceeded about thirty stadia, he was so ill that they returned back to the martyr's shrine whence they had started.

"When he got there, he asked for white vestments, suitable to the tenor of his past life; and taking off his clothes of travel, he clad himself in them from head to foot, being still fasting, and then gave away his old ones to those about him. Then, having communicated in the symbols of the Lord, he made the closing prayer *On present needs*. He said his customary words, 'Glory be to God for all things;' and having concluded it with his last Amen, he stretched forth those feet of his which had been so beautiful in their running, whether to convey salvation to the penitent or reproof to the



hardened in sin. . . . And being gathered to his fathers, and shaking off this mortal dust, he passed to Christ."

The translation of his relics to Constantinople took place a little more than thirty years afterwards. "A great multitude of the faithful," says Theodoret, "crowded the sea in vessels, and lighted up a part of the Bosphorus, near the mouth of the Propontis, with torches. These sacred treasures were brought to the city by the present emperor (Theodosius the Younger). He laid his face upon the coffin, and intreated that his parents might be forgiven for having so unadvisedly persecuted the Bishop."\*

So died, and so was buried, St. John Chrysostom, one of that select company whom men begin to understand and honour when they are removed from them. It is the general law of the world, which the new law of the Gospel has not reversed :

"Virtutem incolumem odimus,  
Sublatam ex oculis quærimus, invidi."

O.

---

---

## THE SPIRIT-RAPPERS.

MR. HOLMES, the humorous philosopher of Boston, says with some truth that spiritualism is the modern plague of theology. Whether it is a delusion of the devil, an hysteric folly, or a mischievous trick, American spiritualism is quietly undermining the traditional ideas of a future state, not merely in those who believe in it, but in the general sentiment of the community. You cannot have people of cultivation and character—judges, men of business, men of science—professing to be in communication with the spiritual world, and keeping up constant intercourse with it, without its gradually reacting on the whole conception of the other life.

In England, I suppose, we do not find grave judges and shrewd men of business generally making any such profession; but that spiritualism is making its way among us is clear even from the pages of the *Cornhill Magazine*. A journal of which 100,000 copies are sold, and whose editor professes that popularity is his measure of goodness, offers a fair sample of the beliefs and tastes of the middle classes who buy it. Mr. Thackeray, after feeling his way with a dull somnambulist story called "The Portent," has in the last

\* Bohn's transl.

number come out with spiritualism in its most exaggerated shape, in a paper written by a person for whose general veracity the editor vouches, and purporting to contain the *audita et visa* of a set of philosophers during a *séance* with the celebrated Mr. Home.

I am not going to examine the evidence on which these stories are brought forward, nor do I pretend to define how much may be due to diabolic fraud, and how much to nervous excitement; though I should be loth to say that I believed the devil to have any thing whatever to do with the phenomena. I only maintain that, whether the devil is mixed up in the business or not, a Christian man ought to be ashamed of taking any part, even of feeling any great interest in the manifestations; ought to think himself defiled and degraded if he meddles with them, and to esteem them the most ignoble, contemptible, and worthless facts which ever pretended to a place within the circle of the science of human nature.

I am aware that many of the "manifestations" are described in language which recalls the miraculous portions of the lives of saints, and that some of the more mystical of our saints have been claimed by "biologists" as mere "magnetic mediums," and the phenomena of their lives have been translated into the language of spiritualism. But this fact does not in the least attract me towards these manifestations, so far as they are merely natural. The Apostle tells me in plain words that God often chooses human folly and weakness, even all that is "ignoble, contemptible, and naught," to humiliate the noble, the proud, and the great. Apart, then, from the supernatural action of divine grace, I think I have the Apostle's authority for despising these manifestations as the most vain, foolish, weak, contemptible, and worthless facts that ever challenged human interest and inquiry. Where divine grace is present, and where the Church sets her seal to its presence, I worship it, and I worship it with all the more reverence and humility because it chooses to manifest itself in what would otherwise be contemptible, for the express purpose of humiliating me. But when divine grace is not there, the contemptible alone remains. Christian mortification is one thing, the starved pride of the Indian fakeer another. The discipline and the hair-shirt of religious orders does not in the slightest degree predispose me in favour of the mutilation and self-torture of the old priests of Cybele and Baal, or the flagellations of bacchanals and orgiasts. When a man of refined intellect and life, like the ex-high-chancellor of England, St. Thomas of Canterbury, can so far sacrifice himself as to allow his hair-shirt to swarm with

vermin, I admire in this point also the noble forgetfulness of self which distinguished that hero; but I gain no more respect for dirt in the abstract. I do not suppose that any civilised man would say that a filthy skin and clothes crawling with vermin are any thing but a degradation, moral and physical, to the man whose sloth indulges in such luxuries. The devil's advocate was surely right in his sturdy opposition to the beatification of the Blessed B. Labré on these grounds. The objections were got over by the other proofs of sanctity, and even thereby turned into fresh proofs of mortification; but in their mere human aspect, before they were thus transfigured, they were simply disgusting. And even when they are glorified by holiness, the stomach heaves at them perforce. I well remember how the man who had charge of the relics in the cave of St. Lorenzo at Subiaco described the face of disgust of Pius IX., in the spring of 1847, when the point-studded shirt of the saint was shown to him, and he was told how the wounds beneath were creeping with maggots even during the man's life. So again, I would not disparage the gift of prophecy; but apart from grace, the clairvoyance and second-sight that counterfeit that gift seem to belong only to degraded natures, to be joined with the weak will of hysterical or somnambulist patients, and to be nearly allied with forms of idiocy, insanity, and varied self-delusion. It is an unfortunate and a degraded state, worthy of pity, not of wonder and admiration.

Nature comes before grace; and though in exceptional cases grace transfigures nature, and exhibits its highest forms in natural weakness, yet in general grace uses nature as it already exists. The heathen virtues did not cease to be virtues when Christianity came, though sometimes Christianity exhibited her new virtues in their freshest perfection in persons to whom the most admired pagan virtues seemed to be wanting. But St. Paul explains why this was done; the most foolish and contemptible persons and qualities were chosen, were transfigured, and informed with wisdom and strength, and were used to overcome all that the world honoured, and generally honoured with good reason, to show that God in weakness and folly is mightier than man at his strongest and wisest. But He did not thereby alter the old relations of weakness and strength, of wisdom and folly. Because weakness full of grace is stronger than graceless strength, it does not follow that graceless weakness has become as noble as strength. Weakness and folly and dirt remain truly contemptible, truly degrading, except in those

particular cases where God chooses to inform them with His grace, and to use them for His special purposes.

I think I see in our current literature many indications of the complete oblivion into which this truth has fallen. In fact, there are many minds in which it has become quite inverted. Like Solomon, they have turned to the contemplation of wisdom and folly, without arriving at Solomon's conclusion, that wisdom is as superior to folly as light to darkness. Indeed, they prefer both darkness and folly to their opposites; they grope about in the "night-side of nature" in the hope of extracting from its confusion and gloom some fresh illumination, even some fresh mental faculty. The general interest that was taken in the late religious revivals, and the judgments that sensible men formed concerning them, indicated the prevalence of the mood of mind to which I am alluding; though I must do people the justice to own that they did not profess to admire the peculiar revival manifestations for themselves, but only as evidences of a supernatural influence. They declared themselves ready to test the alleged miracle by its moral effects; but either their inveterate prejudices, or a certain critical inability, so interfered with their good intentions, that their willingness never strengthened into will, and they could never see any facts but those which they wished to see. I have no reports of the late Irish revivals by me; but the following extracts from a book published in 1694, under the title of *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or the Foolishness of their Preaching discovered*, will show the relation of the revivals of the nineteenth to those of the seventeenth century, and the constant character of these manifestations. And first, that the effect depends not on the matter spoken, but on the manner of speaking it: "Such is the force that a loud voice and whining tone, in broken and smothered words, have upon the animal spirits of the Presbyterian rabble, that they look not upon a man as endowed with the Spirit of God without such canting and deformity of holiness. A person that hath the dexterity of whining may make a great congregation of them weep with an ode of Horace or eclogue of Virgil, especially if he can but drivel a little either at mouth or eyes when he repeats them. And such a person may pass for a soul-ravishing spiritualist, if he can but set off his nonsense with a wry mouth, which with them is called a *grace-pouring-down countenance*. The snuffling and twang of the nose passes for the gospel sound, and the throwings of the face for the motions of the Spirit. All they do is to affect the passions, not the judg-

ment." And this seems to me to proceed from their radical misconception of the relative value of our natural faculties and virtues, and from their theory that Christianity is to build, not upon the gold and silver of natural nobleness and goodness, but on the straw and stubble of passion and hysterical excitement. From this theory follows a sort of apotheosis of disease. I find in the book I just now quoted that one of the Scotch preachers said publicly from the pulpit, of a person who had been reduced to so desperate a condition that his hands were bound to prevent him committing suicide, as he threatened to do: "This is the best man in my parish; would to God ye were all like him! he does truly fear reprobation, which not many of you are aware of." Another, praying in public for a woman similarly troubled in spirit, said, "A wholesome disease, good Lord! a wholesome disease, Lord, for the soul! Alas, few in the land are troubled with this disease. Lord, grant that she may have many fellows in this disease!" And another preacher, whose powerful denunciations had driven some unhappy men to commit suicide, declared, "This is a plain proof that the gospel has not been preached in this parish these eight-and-twenty years; for in all that time you have not heard of one that had a tender conscience like these men; but now, when we begin again to preach the gospel, it is so powerful that it awakes men's conscience, and pricks them so at the heart that they cannot bear it nor live under it."

These revivalists, though more annoying than the spiritualists, in that they do not confine themselves to darkened rooms where you have to seek them out, but station themselves in roads and streets to thrust tracts into your hands, and go into the frequented fields and parks and commons to preach at you, are yet in some sense more respectable than the spiritualist, because they do not profess to admire these "wholesome diseases" for themselves, but as manifestations and signs of the inner state of the soul. The spiritualists stand on a different footing. For them these things are merely natural; they loudly proclaim that they have nothing to do with angel or devil; the manifestations are merely psychological, and only valuable in themselves, and not for any further end. So they run into a worse and more incurable mistake than the revivalists. The revivalists honour nervous disease because they believe it to be supernatural; if they thought it was merely natural, it would share the contempt with which they profess to regard the whole of our fallen nature. Despising the whole, they are not very particular about the parts; no one part can be better than an-

other, and none worse. But the spiritualists honour hysteria, somnambulism, nervous excitement, and mania on their own account. Even the Bostonian professor, a strong-minded man in many respects, who delivers himself of admirable sneers about phrenology and homœopathy, is weak enough to speak of cataleptical affections as "the trances that belong to the spiritual pathology of *higher natures*, mostly those of women."

It seems to me that this fancy opens the door to a whole host of delusions. Once get the notion that the mesmeric or cataleptic trance is something that belongs to a higher nature, that in itself it is superior to the ordinary operations of sensibility and reason, and we at once lose all power of testing it; the higher cannot submit to be judged by the lower. Sense has no right to question the perceptions of a faculty higher than itself, and reason is no proper arbiter of an intelligence that it cannot understand. When once I have bowed down to the idol, I have enslaved my judgment to it. I may pretend as much as I like to a sceptical habit of mind, I may fancy that I hold myself in a state of equilibrium, as a judge should do, and that I am ready to give an impartial verdict; but, in reality, I have given my verdict already, directly I have referred these spiritualistic phenomena to a "higher nature."

The materialism of men of science must necessarily result in this exaggerated respect for the anormal and unregulated parts of our nature. Disbelieving in the separate soul, in the immortal spirit made after the image of God, and in the immaterial will and conscience, they can only recognise the results of organisation in all mental phenomena, and they have no test whereby they can distinguish their respective values, except the apparent delicacy of the organs on which they depend. For them the nervous system is the most important tissue in the body; and the manifestations of the most highly exalted nervous system, as they are unquestionably the most startling phenomena of life, begin to be considered the highest aim, the *summum bonum* of man. Miss Martineau expressly declares that she believes the mesmeric trance to be the highest bliss of which a human being is capable. Idiots and imbeciles are objects of respect in many rude and religious populations, Christian, Mahometan, and heathen. But that is because the simple-minded people think that the minds of the unfortunates are in a continual ecstasy, and that they can dwell in the Divine presence; but spiritualists believe in no such supernatural employment of the ecstatic soul. And yet they seek this trance for its own sake, in spite of the manifest

weakening of all the mental powers which is its physical result, and the deep degradation that is its moral consequence.

There is a department of spiritualism to which these observations do not seem at first sight to apply; I mean, that which its votaries would place in the category of facts, to be determined, like all other facts, by the common rules of observation and experience. Such facts are those which we are called upon, not to believe, but to suspend our judgment about, in the article in the *Cornhill Magazine* to which I have referred. But here also I find the very pretensions which I have already combated. I am told that these spirit-rapping manifestations are things which "go beyond the precincts of our present intelligence;" as if the writer expected that they would add a fresh sense to our mind, or a fresh syllogistic figure beyond *barbara* or *baroko* to our reasonings.

I have reason to believe that the whole account of the *séance* with Mr. Home in the *Cornhill Magazine* has had the effect of increasing the scepticism of the most capable of the Catholics with whom I am acquainted. I know of persons who have seen Mr. Home's performances, and were doubtful before, whose doubts have been confirmed by the article in the *Cornhill Magazine*. There is so much of nervous excitement about the narrator, so much that shows that he and the rest of the party were obliged to manipulate their nerves and to exalt their fancies before the manifestations would occur, that I own myself disposed to consider the competency of the witness, if not his honesty, sincerity, and veracity, to be seriously compromised. The darkening of the room, only varied by the pale light of a curtained window and the flickering of an expiring fire; the "stillness of expectation," "so profound that for all the sounds of life that were heard it might have been an empty chamber"—are elements of nervous delusion that it requires a good deal of care to correct. We all know what it is to wait for a clock striking,—the way in which the minutes lengthen out, and seem as if they would never end, till at last the first stroke of the bell quite startles and surprises us. If the mere waiting for such a common phenomenon so affects us, the case becomes more serious when we are waiting for we know not what,—when in the dead of night we are listening for burglars, or for the crackling of fire,—when

"The house beams moan,  
And a step unknown  
Is surmised on the garret-stairs."

But thieves and fire are quite eclipsed by events beyond all known laws of nature, like these preternatural manifesta-

tions. I can scarcely realise the tension of nerves which the expectation of their coming would cause. The Bostonian professor has some remarks which apply by analogy to this case: "Just keep your ears open any time after midnight, when you are lying in bed in a lone attic of a dark night. What horrid, strange, suggestive, unaccountable noises you will hear!" Then he goes on to enumerate the fancies "that make your heart roll over and tumble about, so that it feels more like a live rat under your ribs than a part of your own body;" then follows a crash of something, and "you are damp and cold, and sitting bolt upright, and the bed trembling so that the death-watch is frightened and has stopped ticking." I cannot help thinking that this is something like the state which all the company at one of these *séances* try to get into—a state in which the beating of one's own heart may be mistaken for the thumping of a pavior, one's own breathing for the whistle of a steam-engine, and when the tremulous shapes formed by the pulsations in the veins of the eyes gain for a moment a consistency that seems quite objective. But manifestly no sane man would put himself into such a state, if he wished to be a faithful observer and recorder of facts. And the testimony of a body of men in this state, who also hold the theory that it is a high condition of human development, so that they are less on their guard against the delusions which it so easily induces, seems to me to be not worth much more than the testimony of a number of the inmates of a Bedlam to the objective reality of their hallucinations. All of us have the elements of insanity in our brains; in our dreams we are stark mad; but Providence puts on a strait-waistcoat when it removes all power of voluntary locomotion. To believe our waking dreams is not to cure our madness, but to reject our strait-waistcoat and our padded room. He that trusted implicitly to his dreams, who lived in his night-world instead of his day-world, would be certainly mad. I cannot say that I think very differently of the man who lives in the strange world of Mr. Home's *séances*.

In the midst of this nervous tension, after the excited ear had been gathering a wild air full of strange transitions from the noise of an automatic accordion, which had the goodness to exhibit its powers in the dark, Mr. Home, who was seated before the darkened window, said in a quiet voice, "My chair is moving; I am off the ground; don't notice me; talk of something else;" and they all saw him, or thought they saw him, lifted into the air. When he was there, they could not see him; but he described his position: "He told



us he was going to pass across the window, against the gray silvery light of which he would be visible. We watched in profound stillness, and saw his figure pass from one side of the window to the other, feet foremost, lying horizontally in the air." (He had before told them that he was in a horizontal position.) "He spoke to us as he passed, and told us that he would turn the reverse way, and recross the window; which he did." It is a fact, I believe, that in some kinds of mesmeric trance the patient sees all that the agent tells him to see; any way, the conditions of this particular example are too suspicious to justify any man in changing his mode of thinking concerning the whole matter, and in beginning to put faith in what all daylight experience declares to be either a delusion or a trick. The appeal to the omnipotence of testimony to prove any thing is out of place when the competency of the witnesses is questioned. If we are to believe all that we are told, and all that we can find respectable men to avouch, we must say good night to reason. "Every human proposition," says Sir Walter Raleigh, "hath equal authority, if reason make no difference:" but reason will make a difference in spite of the self-assertion of the most positive witnesses.

I hope that your readers will not misunderstand my object. I neither deny the possibility of the facts as miraculous, nor the possible agency of the devil in them; but I think we have too much overlooked the hallucinations inseparable from a high state of nervous tension, and the influence which the opinion that this state is a noble and high state of existence must have on the reverence with which such hallucinations may be received. He who believes theoretically that dreams are communicated by angels, will trust his dreams; he who believes that a state of nervous tension is the highest condition of human nature, will be slow to doubt of the reality of the revelations which he receives in this state. On the other hand, the man who sees the image of God in the human free will and the human reason, but in the nervous irritability, the dreams, the passions, and bodily movements of man only the image of the beasts, will be very slow to degrade himself so far as to take any special or practical interest in the development of these animal powers, especially when their development is found to have the most deleterious effect upon both body and mind.

---

A TRUE REPORT OF THE LIFE AND MARTYRDOM  
OF MR. RICHARD WHITE, SCHOOLMASTER.

AFTER that the council had proved these happy men, and found in them no refuse metal, but pure gold, they sent them towards their own country again, with the like pomp wherewith they were brought thence before, *Christi*

Gal. vi. *signata in corpore ferentes* ("Bearing the marks of Christ Jesus in their bodies"). Thus it pleased God

by the weak to confound the strong, and by the simple to overcome the prudent; for whereas their adversaries purposed through tortures to increase their own credit, and to quench the faith of these blessed confessors, behold their tortures turned to the foil of the enemy, to the eternal praise of the men afflicted, to the honour of God, and to the good example of their dear country. *A Domino factum est istud et est mirabile in oculis nostris.*

The seventh assize. And being now returned home, at the first assize they had nothing said unto them, but two of the witnesses were bound to appear at the next assize following, to bear evidence against them as they should be instructed. At which time three of the prisoners were arraigned in manner and form following.

The eighth assize kept at Wrexham, wherein Mr. White was condemned. The arraignment of Mr. Richard White, John Hughes, and Robert Moris, at Wrexham in Denbighshire, upon Friday, being the 9th of October, and the feast of St. Denis, anno Dom. 1584, Sir George Bromley, Chief Justice; Simon Thelwall, Deputy Justice; Piers Owen, Sheriff of the Shire; Dr. Ellis, Roger Puleston, Jevan Lloyd of Yale, and Owen Brereton, with others, assistants.

As the prisoners were coming to the bar, Mr. White in the way before all the assembly blessed himself, whereat a young gentleman there present made no little pastime, often crossing his body in derision, and casting withal mocks and mowes with his head and mouth towards the poor man: but scornful youth is to be borne with;

Francis Bromley. for he had forgotten that the same holy sign of the cross which he scorned was made on his forehead when he was christened, and he had not read that

See the Communion Book. Matt. 25. Christ foreshowed it would appear one day before all the world in glory, at which time he shall be forced to behold it unto his everlasting confusion, if he do not prevent

here God's wrath by daily penance. With like scorn he and his fellows derided the good man's answers to the judges, namely, when he said in Latin, *Christianus sum* ("I am a Christian"); a thing to be lamented with tears of blood, and a matter for the posterity to marvel at, that men bearing the names of Christians could grow to such impiety and height of paganism as to sport at their own profession.

The prisoners, now standing before the bar, first were commanded to hold up their hands; then the pronotary informed them that they stood indicted of high treason, and that they should have their trial. And so he read the bill of their indictment, viz. that they had offended against the statutes of supremacy and persuasion; hereupon the judges demanded, how they would be tried. To the which demand Mr. White answered in the name of himself and his fellows, "We will be tried by you, who are the justices of the bench; for you are wise and learned, and better able to discern the equity of our cause than the simple men of our own country, altogether unacquainted with such matters." But their desire taking no place, a jury was impannelled, and the witnesses examined, Lewis Gronow, Edward Erles, Howell David. Gronow deposed that the said three prisoners were in hand with him on a Sunday in July an. Dom. 1582, to become a Papist; secondly, that he heard them also to acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be supreme head of the Church; thirdly, that he heard Richard White in plain terms to affirm the Pope now living to have the same authority which Christ gave unto Peter.

Gronow's deposition against the three prisoners.

Erles deposed that he heard White rehearse certain rhymes of his own making against married priests and ministers; secondly, that he called the Bible a bubble; thirdly, that he termed Justice Bromley, *ustus y fram*; and fourthly, that he defended the Pope's supremacy.

Erles, his deposition against White only.

Howell David, against Mr. White, deposed that he heard him complain of this world; and secondly, affirm that it would not last long; thirdly, that he hoped to see a better world; and fourthly, that he confessed the Pope's supremacy.

Howell David, his deposition against Mr. White.

The said Howell David deposed against his cousin John Hughes, that meeting with him at a place called Rhud y Ceirw, in Ruabon parish, he sought to persuade him unto the Roman religion, adding the churches of Protestants to be full of wicked spirits and the Pope supreme head of the Catholic Church;

Howell David, his deposition against John Hughes.

moreover, that he sent one John Griffith, a priest, unto him  
 An impu- after this conference between them, who tendered  
 dent lie. to bind him by oath unto his Roman faith. And  
 all this talk both the prisoners denied not to have been,  
 before their apprehensions.

Thus the examination of the witnesses being received,  
 The prison- the judges demanded of the prisoners what they  
 ers were foundguilty in the statute of persuasion before it was devised many years. had to say against the evidence for their own defence; the prisoners took exception against the witnesses, and with many circumstances showed their depositions not to be allowed. That Lewis Gronow had been on the pillory for perjury by the procurement of Mr. Tudur Probert, and was not therefore to be admitted as a lawful witness, referring themselves for the truth of this matter to the knowledge of Mr. Simon Thelwall himself. Thelwall answered, if he had committed perjury, he hath had his punishment; it may be he telleth truth in this point. John Hughes his speeches to the justice were these. "Now they have made an end, Mr. Justice, and said what they can against us, I trust we shall be also heard what we can say for ourselves. I am able to prove that two of these witnesses have been bribed to bear false evidence against us;" whereat Thelwall started, saying, "What, what dost thou say? that they have been bribed?"

*Hughes.* And am able to prove it.

*Thelwall.* How much had they?

*H.* Thirty-two shillings.

*T.* Who gave it them?

*H.* They had it.

*T.* How canst thou prove it?

*H.* Mr. John Wynne ap William Madock Goch, a gentleman of this parish, told my fellows and me, that one Peter Royden, entering into speech of us, informed him how Lewis Gronow and Ed. Erles received xvis. a piece to bear this false witness; and that Royden himself was offered xvis., but he refused it.

This money was given by Jevan Lloyd of Yale the year he was Sheriff, but he knew not that so much money should be paid for his own grave. But alas, by this it is

The gentleman was called before the bar and deposed, the prisoners' report declared unto him, the which he reiterating before all the hall justified to be true; whereat the assembly were greatly astonished, and the judges themselves not a little daunted. Nevertheless, having before laid down the plot, whom they purposed to kill and whom to save, it was not for their purpose to yield unto the truth; but they went to cast a mist over the eyes

of the inquest, that they might not see their legerdemain ; for Thelwall, turning to the jury, answered the gentleman's deposition in these words.

clear their malice to be without excuse.

"It is not likely that any man should give any money to bear witness against them ; for what advantage should any man have by their deaths ? As touching Howell David, his reward was not with the least ; for he had the benefit of a bond of two hundred pounds, which he had forfeited to his cousin John Hughes ; he had also his lands from him, by the friendship of Sir George Bromley, who in consideration of this his good service denied the prisoner justice and law against him." The words that the poor afflicted man used to the justice concerning the said Howell his cousin were these : This man hath taken away my house and lands from me and my children, beside all law and conscience, and now he seeketh my life and blood ; (I appeal to you, Mr. Justice,) whether he be an indifferent witness against me ; moreover, he committed perjury in deposing before the council that I did not receive one pennyworth of harm by him at what time he kept forcible possession in my house, whereas I can prove that he and his people consumed divers gallons of butter and cheeses of mine, and spoiled me of a blanket and other stuff ; and Mr. Jevan Lloyd of Yale, there sitting, knoweth well what man of conversation Howell David is, and hath been, and as I am certain that he hath forged these matters against me, so may I also take upon my soul that he believeth Mr. Griffith, for it is well known that Catholic priests do not use to tender oaths unto any person to be of their religion.

A sorry shift to avoid so evident a proof.

And thus this part of the tragedy finished.

The prisoners, excepting against the witnesses (as is before declared), denied the evidence to be true ; "Therefore, Mr. Justice (said the prisoners), we beseech you to consider that we are falsely accused by foresworn men, borne to that purpose ;" whereunto Thelwall answered, "Well, well, you are likely to feel the smart of it ;" and so turning to the jury he read the statute of persuasion, repeating often such words as seemed to make against the prisoners ; then preparing himself to give the charge, as a preamble he discoursed before upon the evidence, extolling the witnesses, dispraising the prisoners, Mr. White by name, remembering in particular his behaviour at a sermon in the church, and another sermon before the bar, where he and his fellows stamped with their feet, and because their stubbornness might appear more manifestly to the inquest, Mr. Thelwall demanded of them

A charitable answer of a judge.

A greedy blood-sucker.

such questions as he knew they could not answer with safe conscience affirmatively. The first question was, whether they would come to the church; the prisoners answered that they were in the Catholic Church, and from thence would not be removed; the second, whether the Queen ought to be

This is not to find them guilty, but by hook and by crook to cast them.

supreme head of the Church; and turning to Mr. White, urged him to answer plainly and to utter his conscience; the prisoner acknowledged to the Queen as much authority as Edward the Confessor and Queen Mary had. Dr. Ellis replied, "There is no reason, White, but thou shouldst confess the Queen head of the Church within her own dominions." He answered that he did acknowledge her to have as much authority as his father and elders did grant to their princes, and withal he asked Mr. Dr. in Latin, *quid est ecclesia?* The

This Dr. Ellis is a fit man to sit in judgment upon the servants of God, who is known to be of as profane a life as any in the world.

which question being a deep point of divinity, and besides his profession was too high for Mr. Dr. his capacity. Here Mr. White was charged by some of the company to have spoken words to Lewis Gronow his accuser, directly approving the Pope's supremacy, viz. that he affirmed Christ to have twelve Apostles, and that of them He chose one to be head, whom He named Peter; that unto him He gave power to bind and to loose, and in him to his successors: the prisoner answered that these were not his words, but St. Chrysostom's. John Hughes likewise, to this question of the supremacy, said in effect as his fellow had done before him; and Robert Moris being demanded also this point, answered that this question was to be learned in schools by divinity, and not before the bar by compulsion or penal statutes. Mr. Thelwall demanded again, what if the Pope came with a power to invade the realm, and to fight against the Queen, whose part would he take? Moris answered that he was well assured that the Pope would not come to fight against the Queen. Then Mr. Thelwall, having wrested from these men so much treason as would serve his turn to despatch them, turned to the jury and said, "Now you may see the stubbornness of these fellows; demand what you will, they will answer nothing directly; it standeth the Queen upon to look unto such lewd companions as these are and their like, for by such kind of people the Queen and the realm have been divers times in danger." And

A fine sleight to deceive the poor jury.

so he roved over the insurrection in the north, the excommunication of Pius V., Story and Felton, Dr. Saunders's coming into Ireland, Campion and his fellows, Arden and Sommerfield, Francis Throck-

morton; aggravating the prisoners to be of one religion with the persons before named and recited. At the upshot of this conflict the poor men requested the jury, for the love of God and safeguard of their own souls, to have regard unto their consciences; and Mr. White said, "For my part, I have as much wrong as any can have, and am as guiltless of this indictment as any here, I take God to witness." Hughes also said, "Judge you whether I would make my cousin Howell David privy to any secret matter, and especially touching my life, for we have been at variance about lands this ten years and above. Yonder are sitting on the bench Mr. Puleston and Mr. Jevan Lloyd of Yale, who do know this to be true. And moreover; they know what truth and honesty is in the said Howell my cousin, therefore, I beseech you to consider of him." But the gentlemen held their peace. Furthermore he said to the jury, "Demand of the judges whether their commission be to hang us, because we refuse to go to church, and to answer to the question of the supremacy, and then find us guilty according to your law; or else, for the love of God, weigh and consider of the witnesses what manner of men they be, and how falsely they have foresworn themselves; have regard unto your consciences for the safeguard of your own souls, or else our blood shall be required at your hands." Finally, Moris protested, saying, "I take God to witness, I call heaven and earth to record, I appeal unto the last day of judgment, that I am as innocent of this indictment as the child that was born yesternight. Lay, therefore, God's fear before your eyes, for we are not so much afraid of our own lives as we are careful for your souls."

Note here their wise induction to prove them traitors.

Both these gentlemen do know by this day what offence it is before God to keep silence, when the innocent should be defended.

Here Mr. Justice Bromley appointed the pronotary to read the commission from the privy council, to the which had subscribed Sir Thomas Bromley, lord chancellor; Sir Harry Sydney, lord president of the Marches; Sir Francis Walsingham, the Queen's principal secretary; Sir James Crests, and others. In the end, being ready to dismiss the jury, both judges gave them a new charge again, terrifying the simple men with the sight of the commission from the higher powers. So the jury departed to the church, where they remained all the night following with their keeper, saying that two of them, about an hour after their coming, were sent for to confer with the judges, to know of them whom they should acquit and whom they should find guilty, as it is reported. The next day after, being Saturday, about

eight of the clock in the morning, they returned with their verdict, and found Mr. Richard White and John Hughes guilty of felony and treason; but Robert Moris they discharged; whereupon Mr. Thelwall said that some

See their  
indiffer-  
ency.

favour was showed Moris although he deserved none, being no less guilty than the rest. Marry, the prisoner took it for no favour to be separated from his dear companions, the faithful confessors of Jesus Christ, for he made great lamentation and wept bitterly in the sight of the whole court, saying, "The worse luck I;" whereby assuredly God's holy name was glorified in him, the Catholic religion honoured, many of the audience confirmed by his example, and the justice of God satisfied for the offence he had committed in his manacles, by the compulsion of those men before whom he was now arraigned. Finally, as Mr. Thelwall was ready to give the judgment (for Sir George

For shame.

Bromley could not find in his heart to sit himself that day), John Hughes said, "Come, let us have it; we are as ready to die for our consciences as you are to pronounce judgment against us." So the justice commanded the clerk of the assize to lay down that Moris was acquitted and Hughes reprieved. Then he turned to Mr. White, and said as followeth, "Richard White, thou art accused of treason and found guilty by the country; what hast thou to say why thou mayest not die according to the laws of the realm?" "If I had (said Mr. White) I should not be heard, do you make of it what you will; only this I say, that I am no more guilty than you are a true Christian man; and if I be a traitor, your father and grandfather, and yourself, in Queen Mary's time were traitors." But Mr. Thelwall regarding little the prisoner's words, proceeded to the sentence in this manner

A cruel  
sentence.

following: "Richard White shall be brought to prison from whence he came, and thence drawn on a hurdle to the place of execution, where he shall hang half dead, and so be cut down alive, his members cast into the fire, his belly ripped into the breast, his bowels, liver, lungs, heart, &c. thrown likewise into the fire, his head cut off, his body parted into four quarters. Finally, head and quarters to be set up where it shall please the Queen. And this execution to be done on a Thursday; we will appoint you the day before we go. And so the Lord have mercy upon him."

At which sentence the condemned person was nothing dismayed, neither changed countenance, but resolutely gave answer saying, "What is all this? Is it any more than one death?" After this good work was brought to an end, Mr. Thelwall said to Robert Moris, "Thou art here indicted for



abstaining from the church the space of twenty-seven months, contrary to the peace of the Queen's majesty, her crown, and dignity. What sayest thou, art thou guilty?" Moris answered, "I cannot deny but the bill is true, marry, I have been in prison all the while and before." Thelwall replied, "Thou mightest have had leave to go into the church if thou hadst been willing."

"I might have bought that better cheap five years ago." Moris.

"Hast thou money to pay the Queen?" Thelwall: a wise question.

"I hope her majesty hath no need of my money; and if I had money, I would be more willing to pay it than to lie in prison as I do." Moris: a fit answer.

"Wilt thou now go to church?" Thelwall.

"No; I do not fear your gallows so much as I did your tortures;" at which words Mr. Thelwall started as if he had been stung with a wasp, and in great rage said that if such stubborn fellows as he was were cut off it were no great matter. And so he charged him in a fine of five hundred and forty pounds, charging the sheriff to look well unto him, as he would answer the fine at his own peril. Moris: a constant answer.

Last of all, the wives of the two condemned persons appeared, carrying on their arms two little infants, whom Mr. Thelwall solicited in courteous manner to reform themselves, and not to follow the ways of their disobedient husbands. But the wives refused to follow his counsel; and Mr. White's wife said unto him, "If you lack blood, you may take my life as well as my husband's; and if you will give the witnesses a little bribe, you may call them; they will bear evidence against me as well as they did against him." But the poor woman was quickly commanded to silence, and together with her companion committed to the gaol, where they made no long abode, for the pitiful gentleman before his departure, upon better advisement, took sureties of them for their appearance another day, and so turned them loose whiles he went about to hang their husbands; and thus ended this day's action. The which was the last day of appearance unto our blessed confessor in this world, and the eighth assize in number from the beginning of his imprisonment—a number mystical in Holy Scripture, as St. Augustine noteth: *Septem sunt* (saith he) *quæ perficiunt, octavus clarificat, et quod perfectum est demonstrat* ("The number of seven doth make perfect, the number of eight clarifieth, and sheweth the perfection of the rest"). For in this eighth assize appeared to the world

Aug. lib. 1,  
de sermone  
Do. in  
monte.

how much the good man had profited in the school of Christ, and what perfection continual patience can work in a resolute soul; who, notwithstanding his intolerable calamity, behaved himself all the time of his arraignment so pleasantly that he moved the people sundry times to laughter, an evident argument of his guiltless conscience, either towards his prince or country.

At his first coming to the bar, Lewis Gronow was asked whether he knew the prisoners; to the which question the disciple of Judas, answering in the Welsh tongue, said, *Adwen yn dda*, that is to say, "I know them well." Mr. White replied, *A nineath adwenon di the yn ddrwg* ("And we know thee bad"); whereat the company laughed, because of the equivocation those two words ('good' and 'bad') have in that language. At the same time some of the assistants, perceiving the said Gronow to be hard of hearing, desired Mr. Justice to speak louder unto him; the prisoner answered, he should better hear than any in that assembly, having so many holes in his ears. And when the jury brought in their verdict finding him guilty of that felony and treason whereof they were in their hearts as guilty themselves, he said, *Non audent aliter dicere propter metum Judæorum* ("They dare not otherwise say for fear of the Jews"), alluding to a place in the Gospel of certain fearful disciples that durst not openly profess their belief in Christ. Many other like speeches he had this while to the inquest and others, the which for brevity I omit; and so he continued to the last breath, that his own fellows reported they never knew him more pleasantly disposed than he was after his condemnation. And the very day of his execution, understanding that the executioner was in hand to bargain the doublet he had on his back, he changed it for a worse that one of his fellows gave him, and told the company how he had deceived the hangman; yea, at the hour of his death, as the executioner was putting the rope about his neck, he smiled and said, "Good William, I would advise thee to leave off this occupation; use it not much, for it is but a simple office;" so little was this resolute man daunted with the fear of death, of whose cup he was sure presently to taste. But I stay too long in these merry conceits, having so lamentable a matter in hand of greater importance concerning this blessed confessor, especially considering that I must over-pass many things in particular, as his behaviour and speeches to his fellows after his condemnation, to his wife, to the ministers, and others, which would require a large volume; and I see this rude treatise is waxen already larger than I purposed at the beginning. Likewise, taking

the cloth in his hands wherewith his eyes should have been covered, he lapped it about his head, and perceiving that it was not well, he called to the hangman for help, and smiling, said, "Put it on, William, as thou art accustomed to others; thou knowest better than I, for I am not very skilful in this occupation." Another merry proceeding was at his first coming to the bar, after that his trial was referred to a jury. Sir George Bromley, for a show of justice and indifferency, commanded the sheriff to return a substantial jury to pass upon him and his fellows, who accordingly returned William Almar, Esq., to be the foreman, and all the rest men of worship and credit, which being called, not one of them would appear, although they were threatened to be fined in a 10*l*. a piece; the which Mr. Justice perceiving, he charged the sheriff to return a *tales de circumstantibus*, which is another jury of such as were present in the hall. And so he returned John Rogers to be foreman, a bankrupt who had sold and mortgaged all his lands, and the rest of the jury simple fellows of small value and less credit. But when Mr. White saw what poor company they were, he said with a loud voice, "Is this your *tales*?" (making as if he had not known what the word *tales* did mean until he saw the jury appear); and then he said, "This is indeed a *tales*, *quales non est in Wales*, neque usque ad *cales*;" which moved the hall to laughter, whereat Sir George being offended, said very churlishly, "A little more of your Latin will cost your hanging." Now to our matter.

Of Brintanor: was drowned.

*The Martyrdom of Mr. Richard White, upon Thursday after his condemnation, being the 15th of Oct. anno Dom. 1584.*

Now the servant of Christ, having passed through many calamities, and drawing towards an end of all his sorrows, was, together with his fellows or companions, the space of ten days before his death, viz. from the first day of the assize to the time of his execution, coupled fast and chained with an huge iron chain and horse-lock, and warded diligently day and night with a band of men. The which cruelty he took to be a preface to death, and a plain warning to make himself ready. The Tuesday before his execution, a gentleman in the sheriff's name offered to discharge him of all his troubles if he would acknowledge the Queen supreme head of the Church within her own dominions; but the man being constant, refused to purchase his own liberty so dear; and the same day, being ready to meat, he called for his knife, telling the gaoler how he needed be so scrupulous as to keep his weapon from him, as though he

Tuesday.

feared lest he should spill himself, being offered his life if he would recant his religion.

**Wednesday.** The Wednesday following he had provided two dozen of silk points, the which he blessed and kissed one after another, appointing his wife to bestow the one dozen (which was of colour white, answerable to his name) upon twelve priests, and the other dozen upon twelve gentlemen to whom he was greatly beholden. Then he bended a single penny and blessed, &c., to be delivered his ghostly father, to whom he was beholden himself; lastly, he caused his garters to be given two priests of his familiar acquaintance; and the day before he had sent his signet or seal of brass off his finger to a gentleman his very familiar friend. All the which tokens the said parties do keep reverently, as a treasure in value more worth than thousands of gold and silver, assured monuments of the good will he bare them in this world, and pledges of the care he would take over them in heaven.

**Thursday;** The Thursday morning his wife, espying David the day of Edwards the mercer to pass by the gaol, moved at his execution. the sight of him, said, "God be a righteous judge between thee and me." But Mr. White understanding the matter, rebuked her, saying that if they did not forgive now freely all their labours would be lost.

About ten of the clock in the morning, the time approaching wherein he must taste with Christ of his last draught, the gaoler came to separate the prisoners and to set them at some liberty. This while, Mr. White hearing a great noise in the backside of the gaol, demanded what it was; and being told that the gaoler's wife made lamentation for him, he turned to his wife and said, "I pray thee, Catharine, go and comfort her." Coming down the stairs to the common gaol, he found the house full of people weeping and lamenting, among whom were divers children, on whose heads one after another laying his hands, he prayed God to bless them; then beholding a number without the gaol, attending opportunity to bid him farewell, he reached them his hands out of the window, and so took his leave of them all; the like he did also with many in the gaol; and whereas one of them, a gentleman who had formerly been his scholar, made great lamentations, he comforted him in these words: "Weep not for me, for I do but pay the rent before the rent-day." Last of all, he bestowed five shillings in small pieces of silver to the poor at the prison-door, the which money a Catholic had sent him to be distributed with his own hands. At his passing to the execution, he gave his wife eleven shil-

lings and his beads, the which was in effect all the wealth he left her. And so, being disburdened of worldly cares, all his care was for heavenly joys, whither the happy soul made haste, groaning with St. Paul to be loosed from the lump of clay, and thirsting with the holy prophet Phil. i. to be with God, the fountain of life—as the hart, Psalm xli. when she is chased, thirsteth after the fountain of water. The hour at length drawing on wherein God had ordained to render unto His good and faithful servant a just reward of all his labours, the sheriff being then entered Piers Owen. into the gaol, said, “White, make thee ready; and you women” (meaning his wife and John Hughes’s wife), “if you have taken your leave depart, and let him prepare himself to die.” The prisoner answered, “Good Mr. Sheriff, have patience awhile, and I will despatch out of hand;” and so he kissed the wives and blessed his little infant (who was not above one month old), making a cross in his forehead. Here his two companions requested Mr. Sheriff to see the execution, but it would not be granted; whereupon they kneeled down, and the wives together with them, for his benediction. The martyr, pointing with his hand unto them, desired God to stand with them; and so went toward the stade which was provided for him instead of a hurdle, saying, “In the name of Jesus,” as he went out of the prison-door. When he was come to the place, he blessed himself; then his arms were tied behind his back, and so the man of God was laid on the stade before named, and drawn through the town to the place of execution, leaving behind him in the gaol his wife and little child, therein declaring himself to be the true disciple of Christ, who had laid a law before in the Gospel that, if any man come unto Him, and did not hate his Luc. xii. father and mother and wife and children and brother and sister, yea, and his own life too, he could not be His disciple. All the way along as he was drawn, he said the rosary, using the end of a string wherewith he held up his irons instead of beads. And that the merits of so holy a man might appear to the world, God vouchsafed to honour his death by a manifest sign; for the elements being clear and the weather dry all that morning, as soon as he was laid on the hurdle the sky waxed cloudy over the town that he suffered in, and a shower of rain poured down abundantly until body and soul were parted, at which instant incontinently the rain ceased. Whereby appeareth that the death of His saints is precious in our Lord’s sight, and the promise made in Holy Scripture performed too, in that the elements should fight for His servants against senseless people. For

the truth hereof I refer me to all those who were present that day at this pitiful spectacle, who never ceased long after to talk of the strange event. Finally, the servant of God being come to an end of his journey, first the sheriff caused a proclamation to be made (as the custom is) that none should approach near the gallows. His arms were loosed, wherewith he turned to the people, and said, "God is merciful unto us; behold the elements shed tears for our sins." After this the gaoler caused him to climb up the ladder, and the executioner kneeled to ask him forgiveness. The martyr gave answer, "I do forgive thee before God, and I wish thee no more harm than I wish mine own heart." This while the sheriff and Owen Brereton whispered together, and first Owen Brereton demanded of him whether he would have a priest. The prisoner answered, "Yea, with all my heart; but I will have no minister." "White," said the sheriff, "thou hast committed heinous treason against the Queen's majesty, the which hath brought thee to this end. Art thou sorry for the same, and dost thou ask her forgiveness?" Mr. White answered, "I never committed any treasons against her more than your father and grandfather have done, unless it be a treason to fast and to pray." Owen Brereton replied, "Yes, that thou hast; for they have been manifestly proved against thee in open court." The prisoner gave answer, "Well, I pray God forgive the witnesses who foreswore themselves against me; and I pray God forgive you, Mr. Brereton, for I never gave cause that you should be so mine enemy." "It is true," said Mr. Brereton, "thou never gavest me cause; but for that thou hast been an ill member of the commonwealth, and not

Sir Hugh  
Sonlley.

worthy to live." Last of all, the Vicar of Wrexham spake: "Dost thou acknowledge the Queen to be supreme head of the Church?" The prisoner answered, "I acknowledge her to be lawful Queen of England, and otherwise I never said; and I beseech you all to bear witness hereof, that they belie me not when I am dead." Sonlley replied, "Why wouldst thou not confess so much before the bar?" Mr. White said, "The question was not asked me; but I told the council at another time that I was her poor subject, and that I prayed for her majesty. Mine examinations are to be seen, and my hand to the same; search the records, and you shall find this to be true. Moreover, that I offered to go out of the realm to pleasure them, or into rocks and deserts, yea, if it were possible, under the ground, to use my conscience in the least offensive manner I might, or into what place soever it would please my prince to send me; but nothing will serve." Again,

Sonlley demanded whether he would forgive David Edwards, his apprehender. He gave answer, "Yes, with all my heart, I pray God forgive him, and grant that we may both meet in heaven. I forgive also his wife, and all those who were any way guilty of my death; and I desire all the world to forgive me, and you who are here present to pray for me, and especial all those who are members of the Catholic Church, whereof the Pope is the head; and to bear me witness that I die in the old Catholic faith, and that I am innocent of all treasons wherewith I have been charged by perjured persons, the which I take upon my death." "Well, well," said the sheriff, "no more of that. Despatch, hangman." Here the company kneeled to pray for him; and prayed himself all the while; then turning to the people, he spake again, saying, "My dear countrymen, I beseech you for God's sake to have regard unto your souls, and to reconcile yourselves unto the Catholic Church; for I fear you are led astray unto everlasting damnation, except you take heed betimes. Remember your souls, and lose not that for this vile transitory muck which Christ hath so dearly bought. This is but one hour's pain to me, and what is that in respect of the torments in hell, which shall never have an end!" Thus he continued his speech a long while, repeating the same over twice or thrice, until the sheriff and others, being offended with his talk, commanded the executioner to climb up the ladder and to despatch him; who preparing himself to execute their bloody wills, asked the prisoner forgiveness the second time; whereupon the martyr, taking him by the hand, kissed it, saying, "I do forgive thee with all my heart; God and our Blessed Lady and St. Michael forgive thee; it is all one to me that thou do this deed as another." Finally, as the executioner offered to put the rope about his neck, he smiled, advising him to leave the occupation, for it was but simple; again he smiled as he went to cover his own face with a cloth and could not. He called to the hangman for help, telling him that he was not cunning in the occupation, the which as he was in doing, the prisoner requested him to deliver the kerchief to his poor wife, although he demanded double the price. So the executioner came down, and the sheriff commanded the gaoler to bid him turn the ladder; at which words Mr. White lifted up the kerchief, and said, "I have been a jesting fellow, and if I have offended any that way, or by my songs, I beseech them for God's sake to forgive me." In the end, as he was

Here he falleth of his own accord to those treasons whereof his adversaries made such ado to prove him guilty.

This blind country cannot say hereafter but it had sufficient warning.

saying the prayer of the publican, *Deus propitius esto mihi peccatori* ("O God, be merciful to me a sinner"), the executioner turned the ladder, and so he hanged awhile, knocking his breast continually with both hands until his senses were taken from him. In the mean time the hangman

He suffered  
in his fet-  
ters.

leaned upon his shackles of purpose to despatch him out of his pains the sooner; but the sheriff, doubting he should die too soon, commanded to cut him down. At which words the people desired him to take compassion upon the poor prisoner and to let him die, the same also two or three gentlemen which were present requested, by whose earnest entreaty he was stayed yet a little longer. In the end the rope was cut, and the prisoner carried to the hurdle, on the which being laid along, as the executioner was busy to remove the irons and to cut off his members, the man revived and recovered his senses again. And although thieves and murderers were well acquainted with the hangman's office, yet he wanted skill to do this execution answerable to the bloody wills of the magistrates, by reason of which he put the martyr to double pains, and exceeded in cruelty the bloody sentence pronounced against him. For, having made a little hole in his belly, he pulled out of the same his bowels by piecemeal; the which device taking no good success, he mangled his breast with a butcher's axe to the very chine, most pitifully; then tearing his entrails, he threw them into the fire before his face, whereat the servant of God never shrunk, nor once showed any sign of impatience, but still continued knocking his breast, until the sheriff's men held his arms back by force. Finally, being ready to lift up the last gasp, he lifted up his head and shoulders over the hurdle, and beholding so cruel a slaughter, he said in the Welsh tongue, "O Duw gwyn pybeth y diw hun," i. e. "O good God, what is this?" The gaoler answered, "It is an execution for the Queen's majesty;" whereunto the martyr replied, saying, "Jesus, have mercy upon me!" and so at the striking off his head he died.

He dieth.

If it may be called a death, and not rather a change into a better life to die for Christ, a happy change from the temporal calamities of this world to the eternal joys of heaven,—from sorrow and pain to rest and solace, from weeping to singing, from misery unto felicity, from the company of sinful men to be conversant with saints and angels, from the sight of the gallows, of the burning fire, of the boiling pan, of the bloody axe, of the cruel hangman, to the sight of God, who now with His own holy hands wipeth away all tears from his eyes, who now rewardeth His good



and faithful servant with a crown of life (the case of all martyrs), for his constant faith ; a crown of justice, for suffering innocently (the case of Abel) ; with a crown of glory, for the shame he sustained by the accusation of wicked men (the case of Naboth). Now the good man from heaven laugheth to scorn the folly of his persecutors, whose wicked malice God converteth to the eternal good of his friend. O glorious martyr, which hath washed and made white his robe in the blood of the Lamb ! O holy arms, which were so often lifted up before the bar for the name of Christ ! O blessed prisons, which were sanctified so many times with the presence of his body ! O happy fetters, wherewith his feet were tied, and his soul loosed from the band of sin ! O precious wood, which was the instrument of his glorious martyrdom ! O sacred ground, which is hallowed with the martyr's blood ! from whence it crieth unto heaven for vengeance, by so much more forcible than Abel's blood by how much his cause was more honourable, and his torments greater. And the soul from heaven prayeth for his benefactors and friends on earth, by so much the more effectually by how much they draw nearer his steps in life and conversation. The body was locked in prison, but the soul was made free ; the dungeon was dark and loathsome, but the mind was illuminated with light from God. The members were replenished with wounds and wallowed with blood. But although the outward man was corrupted, yet the inward man was renewed from day to day ; the lump of earth was betrayed to the hands of the wicked men, and they have executed their malice upon it ; for what else could be expected at their hands, being his disciples who was a murderer from the beginning ? But his spirit, purified with the fire of tribulation, as gold in a furnace from all earthly dross, returned to Him that made him.

Therefore, I may truly conclude of our martyr with the words of St. Cyprian : The enemy locked his feet and made fast those happy legs with infamous fetters, as though his soul might also with his body be fettered, or that gold with the rust of this iron be corrupted. These fetters and locks are no bands, but an ornament to the servant of God and confessor of His name ; the feet of Christians are not tied to their rebuke, but clarified to their renown. O happy feet, born in a good hour, which are not by the smith, but by the Lord of glory, set at liberty ! O happy feet, bound in a good hour, which have run so blessed a race to paradise ! O happy feet, bound for a while in this world that they may be always free with God ! O happy feet, made heavy and slow

with bolts and horse-locks, but light and swift in their journey unto Christ, for the expectation of our felicity promised is secure and certain (as learned Leo telleth us) where is participation of our Lord's Passion. What shall we, then, think of this constant man who hath fought a good fight, who hath consummated his course, who hath kept his faith? What else, but that our Lord hath rendered unto him his crown of justice, a just judge, and that he resteth from all his labours, for his works do follow him? Whereby the Catholic reader may understand and learn that it is not an easy matter to be made worthy of the crown of martyrdom, beholding so blessed and perfect a man to pass into the same hardly through shame and rebukes, banishment from his country, displeasure of his friends, persecution of enemies, need and poverty, imprisonment, dungeon, stocks, fetters, chains, bolts, horse-locks, manacles, false evidence of witness suborned, wicked verdict of false juries, cruel sentence of wicked judges, rope and gallows, the bloody axe of the butcher, the barbarous hands of the hangman;—that man must have a resolute soul who purposeth to vanquish all these afflictions; but this man hath vanquished: and how? By following the advice of his Captain, who biddeth us first sit down and reckon the charges before we lay the foundations. The want of which consideration is the true cause of the miserable return of so many cold and inconstant Catholics into their old vomits again. This is the way to heaven, this is the ladder of Jacob, these are the steps to martyrdom; we must not think that any thing chanceth to the servants of God without His consent and providence, of whom He hath said, "He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of mine eye:" nothing can be done against them by men on earth but it is before by the premeditate council of God concluded in heaven. Pilate had no power over Christ but as it was given him from above, nor any tyrants in their days over the holy martyrs without God's permission. Whom He purposeth to crown He suffereth the enemy to rack, not accepting redemption that they might find a better resurrection. And though the simple people are borne in hand in printed books, published with privilege and authority, that no man suffereth for his conscience, yet the innocency of this man is apparent to God, before whose eyes the subtle enemy can cast no mist nor colour of treason against him; and the same one day will be apparent to the world, when this blast of heresy will be blown down to hell again from whence it had root. And neither was our glorious martyr at all discouraged with the name of traitor, for he had read that

St. Stephen was accused to have spoken words against God and Moses ; St. Paul to be a seditious fellow ; and Christ our Saviour a subverter of His own nation and an enemy to Cæsar. Yea, it was the common practice of old paynim tyrants to feign that they punished in holy men, not religion, but treason ; and this they were not ashamed to publish, envying the confessors of truth the name and honour of martyrs. And I pray you is it any marvel, for what participation hath justice with iniquity ? Or what society is there between light and darkness ? Or what agreement between Christ and Belial ? Or what part hath the faithful with the infidel ? The light of the sun, which is a friend to all the world, is yet an enemy to weak eyes ; but he that is in filth let him be filthy still. Our holy confessor is past their malice, his soul in glory, his memory in benediction, his ashes and relics in veneration. The sun when it riseth clear, pierceth not more bright from east to west than the fame of his death pierced the hearts of all Wales from north to south ; the wiser sort lamenting to see justice trodden under foot, the simple people honouring his patience and constancy for the faith of the old Britons their dear progenitors. Yea, I dare say, that among so great a multitude as were beholders of this cruel tragedy, there were not a score present but they believed him at that instant (notwithstanding all his external miseries) to be in far better case than themselves ; for that nation, although the terror of laws driveth it to dissemble with the world, yet cannot be brought generally to believe this new deceit of lying masters to be true, nor to persuade themselves the faith of their forefathers (from whom they had received so many monuments and examples of virtue and godliness) to be false. It is not the learning of ministers, neither their good life, nor their great miracles, that can persuade a whole nation from the religion which it hath kept since the Apostles' time to this unfortunate age inviolably. And lest I be thought to forge this thing of my countrymen, I refer me to those who were at this man's arraignment and execution ; they can report the demeanour of the people towards him. I refer me to the executioner, who caused himself to be shut up in a chamber close prisoner, for fear of his life, and came forth at length with a timorous heart to execute this cruel deed ; he can resolve you with what countenance his speeches were received of the multitude, when he lifted up the martyr's head, and showed it to the people, saying, "This is White's head, this is White's head ;" being either not so bold or not so shameless, as to name him traitor, according to their ac-

customed manner in such a play. I refer me to the gaoler, who can witness with what difficulty necessary things for his execution were provided. The ladder he was fain to steal at midnight, from the backside of a man's house. The coals his servants were forced to carry on their backs from the coal-pits two long miles, for want of a horse, which he could neither borrow nor hire. The axe he was glad to take from the butcher's stall, because he might not entreat any smith to defile his hands with such a work. What should I speak of the pan wherein his quarters were boiled ; of the water, fire, rope, and other implements necessary to the slaughter ? How hardly the said gaoler came by these things that day the town of Wrexham can testify. And is it any wonder ? The people knew his innocency, being well acquainted with the good man's conversation the space of twenty years together ; they knew his cause to be just and honest, being directly for religion. They knew the example to be rare, the like never heard of in Wales since the death of St. Winifred, tracing therein the happy steps of Albanus is White in English. his blessed countryman St. Alban, the first martyr of the ancient Britons, and protomartyr of this island.

But it may be here marvelled why the gaoler showed himself more forward than his office required to spill the blood of the good man, whom a little before he greatly favoured. Forsooth, the poor wretch was enjoined in penance by the judges to play the hangman for a fault that he had committed after the prisoner's return from the council, the which was this : having conceived a good opinion of him and his fellows, he was contented to set them at liberty, upon their only promise to return against the next assize following, wherein they should be arraigned, having lately been manacled and indicted of high treason. And although the prisoners at the time appointed kept promise, nevertheless the gaoler was shent and put in fear of his life. But at this cruel murder he made the magistrates some parts of amends.

Now the execution being ended, Lewis Gronow, the good man's principal accuser, beholding such cruelty done to him, and knowing him to be innocent, repented with Judas for betraying innocent blood ; but he brought not the money back again with Judas the which he had received for his life. For he came to Denbigh, where the next assize following was kept (his conscience moving him, no doubt by the special providence of God that the innocency of the martyr and his companions might be evident to the world,

and the adversaries' malice detected) ; before the gaoler and a great multitude of people (whose eyes glared to hear the discourse), he acknowledged his fault to the prisoners, as it may appear in a letter sent from the said prisoners to their friends, of the same matter, whereof this is the copy.

*“ A copy of a Letter sent from John Hughes and Robert Moris concerning Gronow his confession to them at the assize at Denbigh in May, after the execution of Mr. White.*

After our hearty commendations, these are to let you understand that in the assize week a thing chanced unto us greatly beyond our expectation ; for Lewis Gronow, our principal adversary, came into our gaol, of whom we demanded why he did so wilfully cast his soul away by slandering us so shamefully. To the which Gronow answered that he never accused any of us both, but that all his speeches and doings were against Mr. White alone. We replied that his examination was read before the bar, wherein appeared how he bare witness against us all three. Gronow answered, ‘ Whatsoever was read or spoken before the bar as proceeding from me, more than I tell you, they have belied me.’ And therewith he began to wring his hands and to sigh and groan, making great lamentation, and exclaiming against himself ; further telling us that he was tormented in conscience for the offence he had committed against Mr. White, more than for any offence that ever he had done in his life. Here he told us that he was enticed to this wicked deed by the fair promises of Sir Hugh Sonlley, vicar of Wrexham, and David Edwards, mercer, to see him enlarged out of prison and his debts discharged, the which was afterwards by them performed accordingly. Then he was sent to the Holt to bear witness against us, where we were indicted ; and for his good service there, the vicar and mercer aforesaid wrote a letter in his behalf to Sir George Bromley to procure him by his friendship a placard. The man went to the council with his letter, caused his bill to be drawn, and tendered it to Sir George to be signed as he walked in the garden at Ludlow ; the which Mr. Justice perusing, and finding therein no special matter specified why he should have a placard, refused to sign it ; whereupon Gronow delivered him the letter from the vicar and mercer, wherein they signified that the bearer was the man which followed against the papists ; the which when Sir George Bromley perceived, taking Gronow by the hand, demanded whether he was the man that followed against the papists. Gronow answered that he was the man that followed against Richard White, and no man else. Mr. Justice replied that he could not have his bill signed unless he would follow against all three. And so turning from him, <sup>A most corrupt judge.</sup> he sent two of his gentlemen which attended on him in the garden, Thomas Puleston and Moris Jones, one after another, to persuade him to follow against us three, if he would have his bill signed, the which (as he said) he utterly refused to grant. This

course failing, Mr. Justice was in hand with him to swear that he would at the least bear witness against Richard White, but he denied to swear; then he required him to put in sureties, and that also he denied to do. In the end Gronow yielded to deliver his promise, and gave Sir George his hand thereupon, that he would meet him at the next assize following; and so his bill was signed and a placard procured from the council for him; by virtue whereof and by friendship of the vicar and mercer before named, there was gathered for him at Wrexham thirty shillings; and afterwards, returning home to his own country among his friends and kinsfolk, twenty marks. All this he protested to be true before Coytmor, our gaoler, and a great number of people then present at his speeches. This is all we can certify you at this time. From Denbigh, the 15th of May, anno Domini 1585.

Your daily beadsmen,

JOHN HUGHES and ROBERT MORIS."

Thus you may see the man's innocency confirmed every way, in his lifetime, at his death, and after his death, by the deposition of a gentleman at his arraignment, by his own protestation at his last breath, by the adversaries' confession here, and by God's miraculous operation for him even in his lifetime (as it may appear by what hath been said already); but much more after his martyrdom, through the just punishment which fell to both judges at once.

John Williams Ma-  
dock Goch. For the one lost his credit, returned home from the bar, and left his wits behind him, who yet liveth

Sir George Bromley. an idiot. The other judge lost his credit with all his friends, and within a while after his life also, that he neither enjoyed office after this day's work nor good hour. The greatest part of the jury dropped away miserably, and never lived to see the next assize following. The crier be-

Simon Thelwall. came a fool and a momme, and so lived a long time, and in the end died wretchedly. But the plague which chanced to David Edwards the mercer was

Christopherson. notable, who, as his malice towards this servant of God exceeded, so his punishment was dreadful, God re-

David Edwards' plaguend. compensing the wretch according to his works in weight and measure. For as he walked abroad with one of his neighbours, about the beginning of Lent, in the same year wherein the holy man died, being now come to the place where he had taken him, suddenly was catched; for there he received his just hire, and thence returned home sick, was laid in a bed; finally, he ended his life in great repentance without fruit (not unlike to the death of Antiochus the tyrant), often naming the martyr and cursing the hour he took him. Of whom it is reported that no man,

from the beginning of his sickness, might well approach near him, alive nor dead, for the horrible stink of his body. So his own foot was caught in the snare he had laid for his neighbour. By the which terrible examples the persecutors may learn to take heed how they anger the servants of God, lest withal He be also moved who dwelleth in them; for the apostle saith that holy men are the temple of God. And although the martyr hideth from their eyes the invisible sword wherewith He striketh, nevertheless it is manifest that he hath it always ready to draw out when God appointeth. Therefore St. Gregory exhorteth to exhibit due fear and reverence to holy men, who when they are moved unto anger, who else is provoked but their Lord who possesseth them? Therefore by so much the more careful we ought to be in avoiding the displeasure of God's saints by how much the more we are persuaded that our Lord doth inhabit in them, who is able to revenge their cause when He listeth. The which good counsel of the holy father a gentleman of the country may do well to remember and follow, who for me shall be nameless, because I seek not his discredit, but the glory of God and conversion of his soul, whereof I pray our Lord Jesus Christ that he may have grace to consider.

Marry, by this token you shall understand whom I mean, that it was his hap to ride on an ambling mare from his parish church upon a Sunday morning, and in the way the said mare received a great blow on her side, the sound whereof was heard by himself and all his people which then attended on him, but nothing seen. Forthwith the gentleman was forced to light, and a sledge sent for to carry the mare into the stable; and there she died shortly after; and being flayed, the place on her side where the blow had been given appeared blue. The which accident I suppose to be a warning unto the gentleman that he should not imbrue his hands in the blood of this martyr. For the same chance fell out in an. Dom. 1578, a little before the apprehension of the man against whom he hath been a principal doer. The which miracle, and the rest that are here in this writing declared, were not showed to make our martyr of a more blessed life before God, but to signify unto us that he was a blessed man and his soul in high favour with God, and to stir in our souls that due reverence towards him which his virtues deserved; for God hath promised to honour them who will glorify Him. The like may be said by the manifold great and strange wonders that his blood, bones, ashes, and other holy monuments of his, have done; the which in particular the incredulity of this time will not suffer to be published;

A fearful death.

but they shall be one day (God willing) made manifest to the glory of God, honour of His saint, confirmation of the Catholic faith, and confutation of heresy.

And here I will end, beseeching the blessed soul of this glorious martyr to bear with me where I have not expressed his heroical endeavours at large agreeable to the worthiness thereof; for he knoweth well that there was not in me want of good will, but of knowledge and cunning sufficient to set forth such a matter. Protesting that I have spoken but few things of much which might be said in the commendation of so holy a man, for I do not mean to add any thing to his praise and honour,—he needeth not our praise, neither desireth the same,—it is enough for him that he hath eternal praise and honour with God and His angels in heaven. But I have bestowed my travail herein to signify the good will I bare him on earth, to procure his mediation for me in heaven, to give the Catholic reader an example of constancy, to bring the adversary into remembrance of his own madness and wickedness, and to let the world understand what open injustice and violence the poor afflicted Catholics sustain for their conscience and religion, under the visor of treason, at the hands of malicious heretics.

---

## Correspondence.\*

### THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

SIR,—The question of the reunion of the Eastern and Latin Churches is now emerging after a century's oblivion. The Bishops of western Germany have established the *Petrus-Verein*, an association of prayers, to which the Pope has given indulgences. In the parish-churches prayers for the renewal of the union are recited after the offices. The association is also established in some dioceses of France, and in one, I believe, there are 30,000 members. The most influential of the French laity are turning their attention this way.

\* It has become necessary to remind the readers of the *Rambler* that when the present division of the matter published into Editorial Articles, Communicated Articles, and Correspondence was adopted, only such general responsibility was undertaken by its Conductors for the opinions and representations advanced under the second and third heads as is involved in their being parties to the publication. Hence admission under the second head was promised, and has been granted, to articles which by no means represent the opinions of the Conductors; while the Correspondence was intended for the discussion and explanation of various matters—historical, ecclesiastical, political, and the like—about which individuals might feel an interest, whether their views agreed with or differed from those generally put forth in the body of the Review.



Besides praying, something is done, or at least written. F. Garin's pamphlet, *La Russie sera-t-elle catholique ?* has made most stir. His name, his former diplomatic position, the relations which he has maintained or renewed with several of his countrymen and old coreligionists were enough to prevent his pamphlet lying unheeded. Though it was rather a programme than a treatise, it stirred up much opposition. I have seen replies of all kinds, in French, German, and Greek. They are all of Russian origin, except that in Greek (since translated and published with improvements at Paris), which was written by Kara-Theodori, the Sultan's physician. Only one of them is worth notice, that of M. Wassilieff, the chaplain of the Russian embassy at Paris, which appeared in the *Union Chrétienne*, a Paris Sunday paper. M. Wassilieff speaks like a gentleman, and says things that may lead to unity. But he says, that in case of reunion, the Eastern Church ought to stipulate that the Western Church should no longer use a dead language. In Germany, several writings on this subject have been published, especially some articles in the theological quarterly of Tübingen. Two years ago there was some Russian correspondence in the *Journal de Bruxelles* to the same effect. The *Civiltà Cattolica* has devoted several pages to this matter. But this is not the tenth part of all that has been written during the last six years. I cannot mention every thing in a letter ; but I must not omit the *Memoirs of Count Schouvaloff*,\* first a schismatic, then an infidel, then a Catholic, and finally a Barnabite, in which order he died at Paris, with the reputation of a saint, shortly after the publication of his work. The Russians have read him with as much avidity as they read De Maistre's *Soirées de Saint Pétersbourg*, and have learned from him what true conversion means, and what is the Catholic idea of sanctity. You English, Catholic or Protestant, might read with equal advantage these new confessions of a new Augustine.

These Catholic appeals to unity are far from provoking a merely hostile demonstration from the Orientals. The above-named *Union Chrétienne* was founded to smooth the way to the union of all denominations of Christians. The misfortune is, that the usual writers in this *Union* are not men of irreproachable antecedents, always excepting M. Wassilieff, who writes under the signature of Abou-Joussouf. The Abbé Guettée, for instance, author of a history of the French Church and of a history of the Jesuits, though he has talents, a good style, and extensive knowledge, is always called a Jansenist, though he denies it ; and he does not hesitate to attack the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. These gentlemen are making a union to prevent the union. Still, their paper is far from useless : it ventilates the question ; it discredits the idea of independent national churches, which the Orientals dream is the normal state of the institution of Christ ; it dissipates some doctrinal prejudices, and establishes some sort of communication between East and West. This is not to be despised ; and we must own that this

\* *Ma Conversion et ma Vocation*, par le R. P. Schouvaloff.

publication, and others of no greater intrinsic value, are gradually leading the Orientals to say that the two Churches agree in doctrine, and are only separated by differences of discipline. The *Nord* has just declared this in so many words ; and F. Martinoff, formerly, like F. Gagarin, a schismatic, now a Jesuit, lately said the same. If your readers were to consult the works of private theologians, they might be unable to come to this conclusion ; but if they only read the authoritative symbolic books of the Russians, they would see that the identity of doctrine is incontestable, while the differences of expression are easily explicable by the differences of the points of view and of terminology. We need not, then, be surprised that the Holy Synod has acknowledged this identity in a solemn act. In 1839, when the Uniate Bishops of Russia left the Catholic Church for the orthodox communion, the Holy Synod declared that their doctrine, in spite of their adhesion to the Council of Florence, had remained orthodox, and that their only fault had been the schism which they had made in the Oriental hierarchy.

These facts are very significant. Take up any old Russian book of controversy, you will find there long lists of errors of the Latins, from shaving the beard to leaving out the Alleluia in Lent, all equally damnable and each a sufficient cause for rending the robe of Christ. The Latin theologians were of two kinds. The first, men of intelligence, who had deeply studied the Eastern dogmas ; the second, men who wrote on the faith of superficial reports, and were inclined to erect the opinions of their school into doctrines of faith. These repaid the Orientals in their own coin, and with interest. They collected every foolery uttered or published by an Eastern, attributed it to the whole Eastern Church, and often added to it what was only due to their own ignorance and misunderstanding. But the first carefully distinguished private speculations from ecclesiastical teaching, illustrated what was obscure, and so found that the foundation of the division was not the diversity of doctrines, but aversion of heart, heated by mutual reproaches and national antagonism. Thus, while the second demanded solemn retractions, public disavowals of heresies that had never been entertained, and absolution given with solemn function, the first thought that, after a few brotherly explanations, each might give the other the 'kiss of peace. Clearly these would appear to the others as men without zeal, under misprision of treason to the Church, willing to sacrifice their eternal interests to a sham union. The zealots have not yet become extinct ; they have made themselves heard in a Paris paper and a Polish review. So among the Russians, many still swear by the list of Latin errors, though it is becoming fine by degrees and beautifully less. The fiercest partisans now only talk of the procession of the Holy Ghost and the authority of the Pope. They have lately added the Immaculate Conception, in consequence of the ludicrous mistake of supposing that we consider the Blessed Virgin to have had no father, but to have been conceived by the Holy Ghost, like her Divine Son. But they explicitly admit the

doctrine which we really believe, even while they combat the phantom they suppose us to hold : they tell us that *Mary was preserved by the grace of God from the effects of the sin of our first parents*. This goes even farther than the Catholic dogma, which teaches that Adam forfeited for Mary, and all his descendants in the ordinary way of generation, the gift of sanctifying grace ; but that this grace, which is restored to us in baptism, was given to Mary from the first instant of her existence, so that the *macula peccati*, the first effect of sin, never sullied her soul. The discussions on the procession of the Holy Ghost need not be very long, seeing that the new Russian *Catéchisme détaillé* declares that the doctrine of St. J. Damascene on this point is to be followed. Now this Greek only differs from the Latins in his terminology, and we have always considered him perfectly orthodox. The primacy of the Pope does not offer any greater difficulties. It would be enough for the Russians to acknowledge Pius IX. as the legitimate successor of the Popes whom they celebrate in their offices, and as inheriting the titles and prerogatives attributed in the offices to those Popes, by virtue of our Lord's words. Some Russians, who perceive and know that these points present no real difficulties, lay hold on certain articles of discipline ; but these reservations are rather diplomatic pretexts than positions which they mean to defend.

We may, then, take it as a fact that, not the doctrinal divergence which is more apparent than real, but rather a moral indisposition is the great obstacle to the reunion. No doubt the chief indisposition arises from the historical national spirit of Russia, which is essentially anti-Polish, and therefore anti-Latin,—for religion is three parts of popular feeling. This national spirit is the result of the long antagonism between Russia and Poland, each of which sought to render itself mistress of the other. But as the Russians have, or think they have, gained the day for good, the antagonism tends to diminish on their side. A similar national spirit animates all the Oriental peoples, especially those who are under the Turkish yoke ; and, as the same territory often contains a contemporary series of four or five nationalities, each of which, at its first entrance, reduced its predecessors to a state resembling slavery, these nationalities detest each other as I suppose Celts and Saxons do in Ireland, a due increase being allowed for the barbarous ferocity and obstinacy of the half-civilised Orientals. The effect of this national spirit is to make the different peoples tend to free themselves from all foreign ecclesiastical influence. Thus in 1848 the Slaves and Roumans of Transylvania took the opportunity to rid themselves of the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople. For several years the Bulgarians have been at open war with the Phanariot clergy. They want Bishops and priests of their own race, and finally to erect themselves into a distinct patriarchate. Their object is well known to the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, who therefore refuse to allow them priests, much less Bishops, of any but Greek origin. In the same way, the Churches of Bosnia, Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia

are tending towards separation. Division from Byzantium is the order of the day ; and the gravity of these schismatic tendencies is increased by the fact that the Greek schism itself is chiefly due to the political antagonism between the East and West, and that the idea of the necessity of ecclesiastical unity has been designedly undermined among the people to justify this schism. The whole patriarchate of Constantinople is in process of disintegration, and ecclesiastical communion will be reduced to a simple commemoration of the Patriarch of new Rome, and of the other Oriental Patriarchs, in the offices of the Church.

Whilst the spirit of nationality was thus arousing itself to break the old ecclesiastical connections, a new spirit was rising, and has now made an alliance with the national spirit—I mean, sympathy with the West, or rather with France. During the Crimean war, the Russians and French were so inclined to interchange tokens of friendship, that the generals on both sides found it necessary to limit it by orders of the day. Since the peace, the Russians flock to France more numerous than ever ; and when the two governments concluded an alliance, it was so much to the taste of both people that no one thought it even strange. The same tendencies are apparent in the Slavic, Roumanic, and Bulgarian provinces of the Turkish empire. They wish to preserve their nationality, but also to inoculate it with the French spirit. The feeling of friendship for France knocks down many a bar. People get to look favourably on all that constitutes French life, and thus gradually lose their contempt for the Latin religion and its professors. I am safe in saying that within the memory of man the disposition to reunite with the Catholic Church has never been less unfavourable than now.

But I must come to something more particular ; and first, with regard to the Russian clergy. In the 18th and in the beginning of the 19th century, the tendency of their learned ecclesiastics was towards Protestantism ; many were real Protestants. Gradually things have grown better, and those who dare to exhibit any heterodox views are rare enough now. The Emperor Nicholas, or rather God's providence through him, has uprooted Protestantism from Russia. The following anecdote will illustrate the manner how it was done. A member of the Holy Synod had composed a new catechism, which had to be approved by the Synod before it could be printed. Now the Synod, like the Roman Congregations, employs a certain number of priests to make provisional reports on each affair brought before it. The catechism in question was by chance submitted to a young priest of good talents and intentions,—M. Wassilieff, I believe,—who in reading over the catechism discovered sundry propositions which reproduced the errors of Luther on merits and good works. These he mentioned in his report, which occasioned an ardent controversy in the Synod. Half the Bishops declared for the catechism, half against it. Protasoff, the Procurator, endeavoured to arrange matters, but was forced by his failure to report the case to the

emperor. Nicholas refused to enter into the merits of the question, but asked which side the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg espoused. "Sire, against the catechism." "I cannot send him away from the city, so send all the Bishops who are in favour of the catechism back to their dioceses." Thus was the Protestant party in the Holy Synod brought to naught. A catechism in conformity with the ancient teaching was afterwards compiled; and the orthodox Bishops, the dominant party, took care to banish from the ecclesiastical schools every thing that savoured of Protestantism. This anecdote I have heard from persons said to be well informed. One thing is certain, that Protestant opinions no longer dare to lift up their heads among the Russian clergy. There is one point, however, in which the influence of the old Bible Societies has had a permanent effect. The Russians are uncertain about the canon of Scripture, and do not scruple to detach therefrom certain books cited as Scripture in the catechism of Peter Mogila, the principal dogmatic monument of the Eastern Church. Now, to conclude, all those who adhere most closely to the ancient doctrine, and have been or are most opposed to the introduction of the Protestant leaven, exhibit the least aversion for the union; certainly, if it ever takes place, it will be by means of this party.

The educated laity may be divided into four classes—the free-thinkers, the revolutionists, the orthodox adversaries of the union, and the orthodox with decidedly Catholic tendencies. For the free-thinkers in Russia, as elsewhere, the Church is a great bugbear; and since the union would be an element of liberty to her, they are by no means favourably disposed to it. The revolutionists are not very different; their politico-religious education is derived from the revolutionary and anti-Catholic journals of France; but among them, those who wish to see the revolution afterwards consolidated by order have more equitable opinions. The orthodox adversaries of the union are actuated, some by inveterate prejudice against the doctrine and discipline of the Western Church, others by fear of the tyranny which the Roman court would practise in Russia, others by the spirit of conservatism, or the fear lest the union would be the occasion of political troubles, and by other considerations of this kind. I have no remarks to make upon those members of the orthodox communion whose sentiments are Catholic, except that their number is infinitely greater than one could at first imagine. The conversions which are continually going on in the upper classes, in spite of the false position which the converts make for themselves and their descendants, form one of the signs of a disposition widely spread. It seems scarcely credible, but it is true, that the Russians who accompanied the Empress-mother in her first journey to Italy after the Crimean war were mostly converts. This was no secret to the court of St. Petersburg; but it was thought advisable to wink at what the law calls apostasies, seeing that the apostates were the men of the highest character in the empire. I may remark, by the way, that the Russian converts, men and women, are in general an honour

both to the Catholic religion and to their country. I do not like parading names in public ; but there can be no harm in my mentioning here the Princes Galitzin, Schouvaloff (a Barnabite, now dead), and Gagarin (a Jesuit), Madame Swetchine and Madame de la Feronnays. In most of the great Russian families there are now some converts ; and the door once opened, the procession winds through surely if slowly. It is certain that in most of these families a fulcrum might be found for the support of the movement of reconciliation.

The middle classes are not numerous in Russia, if we compare it with other European countries. At Moscow and in the provinces, many persons of this class belong to the sect of Starovères, or partisans of the ancient liturgical books. Among the rest, Western sympathies are very common.

The serfs in general know little either of East or West ; for them, the difference between the Latin and Greek Church, is only one of rites, mingled with a few traditions of respect for the Patriarch of Constantinople. Still it would be a mistake to leave them out of our reckoning ; for the greatest dangers might arise from their opposition. We must not suppose that they could be united by a mere feat of sleight of hand. It would be necessary to explain to them with equal simplicity and sincerity how this great work is the will of Jesus Christ, and in conformity with the Slavonic liturgies. All this would require consummate prudence and tact.

The Slaves and Roumans of the Austrian empire are in an infinitely more favourable disposition, as might have been seen when, a few years ago, Monsignore de Lucca, the nuncio at Vienna, carried to the Slaves and Roumans of Transylvania some sacred vessels and other presents from the Pope. The schismatics received him with as much good-will, respect, and honour as their uniate compatriots. In these countries Bishops and priests may be found who make no secret of their desire for union. The people incline the same way. A foreign nobleman, who lately held a military command in those districts, lately told me, "It would be unwise to attempt to bring about the union by means of priests ; the chances would be, that at first the schismatics would not listen to them ; and if the first beginning is a failure, the end will be a failure too. But if the Government were to order some officers who have been stationed for some time in the country to make the people understand the necessity of being reconciled with the Pope, there would very probably be no resistance. They would be delighted to see the Emperor able to hear Mass with them. There would be no need of threats, far less of persecution. The people only remain in schism because there is no one to draw them out of it." It will be asked why the Austrian Government does not take these steps. There are many things to be said in answer ; one excuse—a very weak one, I think—is, that if the schismatic parishes become Catholic, some Catholic abbeys and chapters would be ruined. To explain this, I should have to enter into longer details than I have room for.

Ever since Moldavia and Wallachia were emancipated, or rather placed in a permanent state of revolution, the obstacles to the union have rather increased than diminished, because the revolutionary spirit is every where essentially anti-Catholic. In Bulgaria and Servia the difficulties would be much less ; but all these populations have their eyes fixed upon St. Petersburg.

In the other provinces of the East, the symptoms have been lately very favourable. A fact of great importance, which passed almost without notice, happened at Constantinople, when Monsignore Ferrieri was sent to the Sultan to announce the accession of Pius IX. A deputation of the Armenian consistory, composed of the most considerable men of the nation, presented to the nuncio a profession of faith extracted from the writings of the ancient Armenian doctors, and containing statements upon the production of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son, upon the Incarnation, and the universal authority of the Pope, that were entirely Catholic. The deputation asked, in the name of the whole Armenian nation, to be admitted to Catholic communion upon the basis of this profession of faith. What were the instructions of Monsignore Ferrieri I know not ; I only know that the Prelate demanded of the Armenians that the nomination of their Patriarch and Bishops should be in the hands of the Congregation of Propaganda. The Armenians rejected this condition as contrary to all the ancient canons, but notwithstanding this failure, they addressed themselves, some years later, to Monseigneur Sibour, Archbishop of Paris. However good a Bishop, he certainly was not a good diplomatist ; the body of French Cardinals, more important by their talents and prudence than by their position, would have been a far better intermediary. For some reason, the application of the Armenians to the Archbishop of Paris had no results. But in order that some memorial might remain of their disposition to reunite themselves with the Roman Church, the Armenians caused an account of the whole affair to be printed in the *Revue d'Orient*, a journal which was in those days published at Paris.

About the same time another fact no less characteristic took place in Egypt. It happened that a Patriarch of Alexandria was to be elected ; there were two parties, each supporting its own candidate, and they were unable to come to any understanding. To have done with it, they resolved to refer the election to the Catholic Vicar-Apostolic who resided at Cairo. He was ready to accede to their request, provided they would be reconciled to the Roman Church. A negotiation was entered into for this object, and promised at one time to succeed ; but when the English consul smelt it out, he found means to upset every thing. I do not know whether the good disposition of the Copts found favour in the eyes of the French consul ; yet it is notorious that France has the greatest political interest in the return of the Copts to Catholic communion. There are numbers of them in the Phaoum, a military position of immense strength. The services which these people rendered to Napoleon I. in his Egyptian

expedition, and his Coptic regiments, the remains of which lasted till the end of the first Empire, ought not to have been forgotten, especially as every one sees that either the whole North of Africa is destined one day to become French territory, or else that Algeria will never be held quietly and peaceably. It is strange, then, that so little was made of an opportunity of gaining over and uniting by means of religion several hundred thousands of inhabitants in the heart of a Mussulman country. But God has His own designs, and it is to be hoped that He will not suffer the good dispositions which He inspires to be for ever crossed and rendered nugatory.

It would take too much time to pass in review the other Christian nations of the East, and to enumerate the conversions that have already taken place ; what I have already said is enough to show that the hopes which I entertain are not altogether visionary.

But I have not yet exposed the principal foundation of my expectations. After God's help, without which all labour is vain, my hope lies chiefly in the vague suspicion which may be found in all the Churches of the East, that their position is not altogether regular. This sentiment shows itself in all the books published by members of those Churches. Without being attacked or provoked, their writings are all apologies, miserable enough no doubt, because they come to nothing more than a defence of their separation on the ground of the tyrannous spirit of the Roman Church ; as though the words of St. Dionysius of Alexandria could ever cease to be the expression of evangelical truth : " We ought rather to suffer all things than to consent to the division of the Church of God ; for the martyrs who suffered for the unity of the Church are no less glorious than those who suffered rather than sacrifice to idols." The feeling of this truth is doubtless much weakened in the Eastern Churches, but it is far from being completely destroyed ; and the separatist tendencies of which I spoke above are giving way to those which would again bring this feeling into play. The starovism which is spreading in Russia, and which is opposed by the Russian Bishops in writings that are really remarkable, has had a favourable effect in proving the necessity of ecclesiastical unity, and the guilt and misery of schism. Now we can easily see that when once people are persuaded that separation is not a normal state, they will not be far from making some effort to put an end to this state of things.

Some efforts have already been made ; the great desideratum is to discover the terms of an accommodation. I have had several conversations on this subject with Latins and with Russians who have studied the question, and I have read a good number of pamphlets on both sides. Many of the Latins say, " We have come to a union so many times ; so many Bishops and Patriarchs have at different times been united to the Church ; but the schism was always quickly reëstablished. If, then, we again unite, we must first strengthen the links, and especially we must reserve to the Pope or Propaganda the nomination of all Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops." Others, on the contrary, remark



that such pretensions put an obstacle in the way even of the commencement of a negotiation ; that other means might be found to maintain an intimate union between Churches of different rites ; that we must be practical, and consequently that we must be contented with that which is essential and possible ; and, that no mistake may be made, we must study the ideas which are current among the Orientals, especially amongst the Russians who are labouring to reconcile the Churches. They concede that formerly the Pope was the first Patriarch, and that in this quality he exercised a certain power throughout the whole Church. They do not discuss the question whether our Lord established a universal pastor over His Church, though this truth is expressed with far greater clearness in their liturgical books than in ours ; they choose rather to base their opinions about the authority of the Popes upon the canons of the old œcumenical councils. They all have a great horror of arbitrary power ; and without entering into the question whether the Pope ought to be over or under the council, they say that the Pope ought to govern by the canons of the councils. They have small love for the Roman congregations, especially for the Propaganda, though they approve of the idea which actuated its founder. They will never submit to this congregation ; for this determination they bring forward many motives, but their grand reason is, that they are not infidels. They dislike also the congregation for the revision of oriental liturgies ; they ask whether any of the members of this congregation understand any of the oriental languages. They have similar objections against almost all the Roman congregations. Innocent III., they say, decided matters in consistory ; and so his decisions have become *decretals*, that is, parts of the body of ecclesiastical law. In these consistories we may expect, they say, something of the holiness and wisdom of the Apostles ; elsewhere it is to be feared our account may be with the finesse and corruption of the lower Empire. In all this there may be much prejudice ; but every practical man knows that it is as necessary to take account of prejudices as of the best-established truths. But since questions must be put into form before they can be submitted to the consistory, they propose a committee of Slavonic Cardinals and ecclesiastics that shall sit at Rome for this purpose. They say that this demand does not nearly equal that of the kings of Spain, who did all in their power to hinder any question relating to their subjects being referred to Rome, and who obtained the establishment of a tribunal of the rota at Madrid, consisting of the generals of the religious orders who were fixed in Spain, and were independent of the Roman generals. They say also, that as the ancient Roman maxim still holds good in the East, that an emperor is supposed to embody all the rights and all the will of his subjects, and as in primitive times the people had a great influence in ecclesiastical affairs, it would be proper to recognise the right of the Emperor of Russia to this influence, at least within his own states ; and they think, therefore, that he might be invested with a kind of legatine power like that which the King of

Naples enjoyed under the name of *Monarchia*. You quite understand that I do not come forward as the advocate of these dangerous pretensions ; I merely make them known. But I am altogether of the opinion of Gerson, who, in a French sermon upon the reunion of the Greeks, recently published by Prince Augustin Galitzin, says : "Men of good will for peace in holy Church, whether in general between Greeks and Latins, or in particular reformations, ought to be informed and indoctrinated principally by Holy Scripture, wherein the divine law is delivered, and next by moral philosophy, and afterwards by the holy decrees and decretals, and then by civil law. This consideration is clear ; for he who cannot discern and distinguish that which is of Divine right from that which is only of positive law, erreth easily in judging either of the one or of the other. . . . For there is nothing which so much troubleth the government of Christendom as the wish to rule the spirituality and the temporality in the same manner."

I have put down some general observations on the reunion of the East and West ; one day, please God, I will try to say something on each of the rites of the East.

Y. Z.

---

### SEMINARIES OF THE CHURCH.

SIR,—No one desires more earnestly than the writer of these lines, that free discussion should be allowed us on all matters which the Church has not ruled. No one laments more than I do that bigotry and jealousy which would enthrone the decisions of individuals, or of parties, or of schools, as if divine truths, unassailable and irreversible. Nor will I yield to any one in my desire, that the secular education of Catholics in the middle and upper classes should be the best of its kind, and such as to enable them to take their place in society by the side of Protestants of their own rank. It is not inconsistent with such avowals for me to express my sorrow at a portion of the letter signed "X.Y.Z.," which appeared in your Number for July. I believe that letter has incurred the animadversion of one of our newspapers ; but I have not read it, and, even though I chance to repeat it in substance in what I am going to say, that will not be a reason for my not saying it. For your correspondents should be answered, if they need it, in your Magazine, not out of it, that those who read the one side may read the other.

My own complaint with "X.Y.Z." is this, that in a lay magazine he has discussed a purely clerical subject. If it is a mistake in ecclesiastics to go beyond their calling and their knowledge, and to lecture laymen on secular subjects, I consider it a greater in a lay "X.Y.Z." to discuss the education of the clergy, and to find fault with the existing system, which is founded on the decree of an Ecumenical Council. I certainly think that a writer should be taken

to task who finds fault with provisions sacred both from the persons whom they concern, and from the authority by which they are enforced.

The Council of Trent decrees that a seminary for the clergy shall be established in every diocese, and that it shall consist exclusively of ecclesiastics. "Hoc collegium," it says, "Dei ministrorum perpetuum seminarium sit." These seminaries, if possible, are to be erected "prope ipsas ecclesias;" the youths, there educated, "tonsurâ statim atque habitu clericali semper utentur;" they shall be "pauperum filii præcipuè;" they are admissible at twelve years of age, and they are to learn "grammatices, cantûs, computi ecclesiastici, aliarumque bonarum artium disciplinam, sacram Scripturam, libros ecclesiasticos, homilias sanctorum, et sacramentorum tradendorum, et rituum et cæremoniarum formas." Thus their education is distinctly and professedly narrow (I am not using the word in an unfavourable sense, but to express the fact), as the education of a farmer is narrow, or of an artillery officer, or of a medical man.

If any one thinks me paradoxical in thus speaking, I shelter myself behind the words of an author to which "X.Y.Z." refers. Dr. Newman, in his Dublin Lectures of 1852, speaking of liberal education, says: "If theology, instead of being cultivated as a contemplation, be limited to the purposes of the pulpit, or be represented by the catechism, it loses, not its usefulness, not its divine character, not its meritoriousness, but the particular attribute which I am illustrating; just as a face worn by tears and fasting loses its beauty, or a labourer's hand loses its delicateness; for theology, thus exercised, is not simple knowledge, but rather is an art or a business making use of theology. And thus it appears that even what is supernatural need not be liberal, nor need a hero be a gentleman, for the plain reason that one idea is not another idea."

To return:—by the side of the grave provisions of the Council which I have quoted, let us see what are the views of "X.Y.Z." I have taken the liberty to expand his sentiments into their full meaning by additions within brackets, in order to bring out what I conceive to be their inconsistency in the mouth of a Catholic.

"There are many reasons," he says, "why the question of Catholic ecclesiastical education should be assuming special importance at the present day." After mentioning some of them, he proceeds thus:

"These and other reasons make it important [not for our ecclesiastical rulers, but for your readers] to *consider, whether any modifications, and of what nature, are desirable in the system of our schools and colleges, [which system was determined by the Œcumenical Council of Trent].*

"As I am . . . *simply suggesting* points for the consideration of those [of the reading public who are] better qualified [than myself] to judge, I shall make no apology for *briefly jotting down* a few questions, that have *occurred* to my mind [on a subject which, after fasting and prayer, engaged the anxious attention, and elicited

the definitive decision, of the Fathers of an Assembly 'in Spiritu Sancto congregata'].

"As regards the question of *separate* training for the clergy from boyhood, it seems to *me* [an anonymous "X.Y.Z."] that two questions may be raised, [though the Council of Trent put them to rest three centuries ago], viz. :

1. "How far it is, *per se*, *desirable*, [though the Council desires it so much as to direct the Bishops, every where and individually, to carry out '*tam pium et sanctum institutum*, prout *Spiritus Sanctus suggererit*,'—another sort of 'suggestion'].

2. "And further, how far," with our present objects and needs, "such a system would be *even possible*, [though the Sancta Synodus thinks it so possible, as to decree that, if there be negligence in any persons 'in hoc seminarii erectione et conservatione,' the competent authority '*acriter corripere, eosque ad omnia supra dicta cogere debeat*']].

"I am far from saying that there would not be *room* for a St. Sulpice in England : [so far I concede to the sacro-sancta Œcumenica Synodus, though I must still maintain, pace Patrum Reverendissimorum, that what they call '*sanctum et pium opus*' is the exception, not the rule].

"But [I repeat, in spite of the Council] I *cannot help thinking*, that if the class of men who are trained for the Protestant ministry at our public schools and universities are to be enlisted for the service of the altar, a *very different system* from that of St. Sulpice [which is behind the day as following the directions of the Church] would be found necessary, at least for many of them."

I need not pursue my comment further ; before concluding, however, I am reminded by the last sentence in the foregoing paragraph, that I ought to contrast another passage from "X.Y.Z.," not with the Tridentine Decrees, but with a sentence in the correspondence of the *Guardian* newspaper of last Wednesday.

"X.Y.Z." says :

"Why is it that, while the Protestant minister, ignorant for the most part of theology, fluctuating and uncertain in his views, &c. . . can usually secure at least the *respectful attention* of an ordinary congregation to his stammering exposition of a mutilated creed, the Catholic priest, &c. . . Does that intellectual refinement, that power of varied illustration, that mastery of language and thought, which are the results of an *educated* taste, and fair acquaintance with the standard literatures, both prose and poetry, of our own and other countries, *avail* in the one case to *light up* the broken shadows of an unsatisfying religion with a *glory* not their own, while in the other," &c. &c.

On the other hand, "Medicus Mayfairensis," writing in the *Guardian* of August 8, with what seems like a feeling experience of the matter he is treating of, says :

"It strikes me, that if from time to time some *educated* men *who can speak English in their own tongue*, and not in the dreary,

roundabout, latinised, *somniferous* dialect which is *consecrated to the use of the pulpits in the Establishment*, would take the trouble to get on a tub on a Sunday afternoon in the Park, . . . it would absolutely neutralise the spirit of those trading agitators," &c.

Had I leisure to search the columns of the *Times*, I should find passages in still more vehement antagonism with "X.Y.Z." on the subject of Anglican University preaching.

Thus he is as little countenanced by Protestants in his facts as by the Tridentine Fathers in his opinions.

H. O.

August 14.

### COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

SIR,—Your correspondent "X. Y. Z." has opened several questions bearing on education in our schools and colleges, the importance of which can hardly be overrated ; and the object of keeping these and similar questions before the public eye, provided it be done with moderation, and in the spirit of deference to ecclesiastical superiors, would seem of sufficient magnitude to counterbalance the possibility of occasional mistakes in the mode of treating them. We are no doubt in some danger of presuming that existing methods of education, extensively adopted, and supported by the sanction of venerable names, are right simply because they are established. It is my own conviction, founded on much thought and considerable præ-Catholic as well as actually Catholic experience, that more than one of the characteristics of the present system to which "X. Y. Z." objects, or at least demurs, is founded on a better basis than that of mere prescription ; and the very hearty agreement with him which I recognise, and shall express, on some matters of principle which he has touched in his letter, induces me to hope that, although I may not succeed in convincing him, he will be able to feel that my differences with him are not the result of any blind, or merely "conservative" adherence to things as they are.

Your correspondent thinks the practice which prevails in some of our colleges (as, for instance, at St. Edmund's, Old-Hall Green), of keeping up a distinction throughout all the successive stages, and in all the various departments of the collegiate course, between students preparing for the Church and those destined for secular professions, has a tendency to isolate the clergy from the laity, by giving them too simply professional a character, narrowing their studies and tastes, lowering their social position, and proportionately weakening their future influence. As a necessary consequence of this opinion, he would enlarge the cleric's sphere of reading at college, drawing the line of exclusion at the point only where useful or recreative literature becomes immoral. Such, I think, is the substance of his view on this whole subject. He illustrates it, however, by reference to what he considers the "great moral and

social influence of the Anglican clergy," as derived from their association at school and college with those from whose ranks the various secular callings are replenished.

Your correspondent is no doubt aware that the separate system adopted at Old Hall is an exception to the rule of the English Catholic colleges, of those, at least, in which our secular clergy are trained. At Ushaw, and I believe at Oscott, the same distinction does not exist so far as regards the association of the students, although every where, I apprehend, the line of demarcation between allowed and forbidden books is drawn much more tightly than your correspondent appears to think expedient.

"X. Y. Z." should have known, therefore, that as to the question of united or separate education, he has great authorities, even among Catholics, on his side. My own bias, I confess, is in favour of the Old-Hall practice; it may be because I have been to some extent personally conversant with its working and results. I could even desire that our ecclesiastics were educated in separate colleges altogether. Having, however, no right to a voice in the matter, this wish is simply inoperative. But, as I have undertaken to meet your correspondent on the common ground of open and public discussion, I will go on to give my reasons for this conclusion *valcant quantum*.

So far as I am able to penetrate the mind of your correspondent on this whole matter, I seem to recognise an essential difference between him and myself. It appears to me, under correction, that there is absolutely no parallel whatsoever between the case of the Catholic priest and that of the Protestant minister. In the first place, I am unable to go the whole length of his opinion as to the amount of moral and social influence possessed by the Anglican clergy. I think he overrates it. But whatever it be, either in amount or in value, it seems to me to arise from causes, some of which are incompatible with the circumstances of the priest, *qua* he is a devoted priest, others with his circumstances, *qua* he is a priest at all. The light and easy burden which sits for the most part upon the Anglican minister, leaves him abundant leisure to act upon society (whether for good or evil) by means of personal and merely social intercourse. If he be not "addicted to Popery," but a "sensible practical man, without crotchets," he may skim over the whitening crops of the pastoral field, or the surges of this troubled ocean of a world, with the light step of a Camilla; and it may be said of him,

"Ille vel intactæ segetis per summa volaret  
Gramina, nec teneras cursu læsisset aristas;  
Vel, mare per medium, fluctu suspensus in alto,  
Ferret iter, celeres nec tingeret æquore plantas."

Far be it from me to depreciate the labours of many of the Anglican clergy, which are an example to ourselves. But I believe that, just in the degree in which they approximate to Catholic priests, either in the amount of ministerial labour, or in a just estimate

of the sacredness of the sacerdotal character, their social influence, at least, is likely to be diminished, or narrowed within a very limited sphere.

But there is one characteristic of every Catholic priest, as such, which operates as a most serious drawback upon that peculiar influence which is at the command of every sectarian minister—the rule of celibacy. Taken from a clergyman, even of the Establishment, all the moral and social power over others which is directly or indirectly connected with the allowance of marriage, and how great an inroad will you not make into his popularity! How very much of public consideration does he not gain from being “marriageable,” how much more from being married! Let it but be surmised that he is an “incorrigible bachelor” (and what bachelor-clergyman is hopelessly incorrigible?), and straightway people will begin to find out that there is something perverse and unsocial about him. Again, how much of the (really valuable) “moral” influence of the Anglican clergy depends upon the amiable ministrations of the wife and daughters, though too often, as we know, counteracted by the libertinism of the sons. Here there is a most important cause of influence in the Protestant minister, from which a priest, whether such in fact or but *in voto*, is wholly debarred.

Indeed, I cannot help expressing some surprise that so acute an observer and so good a logician as your correspondent should not have felt it necessary, if it were but for the purposes of his argument, to advert in some way to the subject of clerical celibacy. In discussing the merits of the next question which he raises, that of restricted or more indiscriminate reading at college, some notice of this topic seems to be absolutely imperative. An ecclesiastical vocation is a rare and most precious gift of God. Moreover, like others among His best gifts, it hangs upon most precarious conditions. It is fragile as crystal, and tender as a leaf of the sensitive plant. And the part in which it is weakest and most susceptible during the years of its nursing, is this of the celibacy which it involves. A whole host of attractive anticipations which, in other cases, so far from being unlawful, are not unfrequently even valuable, as a preservative from sin, are to the ecclesiastic forbidden ground. The temptation to indulge in them has to be resisted by him like temptations to sin. How, under these circumstances, it could be safe to extend the range of general reading in the case of ecclesiastical students (for in that of secular students I am disposed to agree with your correspondent) to all books which are not positively immoral, I own I cannot understand. No doubt the strictest discipline and the most careful vigilance, as “X. Y. Z.” observes, may be defeated by a student who is bent on reading forbidden books; but then, one would hope that the moral training, without which all discipline must be useless, would be adequate, as a general rule, to the prevention of such an evil. Any how, this is a sort of argument which proves too much, and would go the length of discouraging the prohibition even of worse books.

Your correspondent thinks that Catholic preaching would benefit greatly by a larger infusion of a secular element. For my own part, I should be inclined to look for this most desirable result to a deeper and more ardent study of dogmatic theology. As to the varied reading, from which your correspondent thinks that Protestant preaching derives its superior interest (to myself, however, that preaching, with the exception of the sermons of those who have become Catholics, and a very few others, always appeared dull and superficial to the last degree), I am myself very doubtful how far such reading is compatible with the requisite attention to theology and its auxiliary studies, not to speak of the restricted capacities of the human mind, which can hardly feel an equal *attrait* to theology and secular learning, and whose powers of apprehension depend so largely upon the interest it can throw into the matter before it. Life, at least college-life, is too short for every thing we might desire to include in it. For my own part, I am not sanguine even as to the probability of classical literature being ever studied in Catholic seminaries to any great advantage. The value of such literature is far less in the amount of actual knowledge it confers, than in the habit of mind it tends to create. If classical literature be not loved, it will soon be dropped, especially by the hard-working priest; and loved it can scarcely be without an amount of labour and an intensity of interest which the conditions of ecclesiastical education render both impossible and undesirable. Hence I should like to see the accurate study and colloquial practice of modern languages (French more especially) substituted for extensive classical reading, with the exception always of Latin, a command of which, in writing and speaking, is absolutely necessary among the accomplishments of a priest.

We now pass, by a natural transition, to the very important question of direct personal *surveillance* out of study-time. There are two opposite theories on this subject current at the present time, which I will endeavour to state as fairly as possible to both sides. According to the one, it is said that you can hardly begin too soon with trusting boys to themselves; that, by constantly haunting them with masters and monitors, you run risk of a mere "eye-service;" blunt, and gradually destroy, self-respect and the feeling of responsibility, and incur the danger of a terrible reaction when the habitual *surveillance* yields, as yield it must in the natural course of things, to an independence of visible restraint. According to the opposite view, which I need not say is that adopted and acted upon in our Catholic colleges, it is felt to be a great matter if we can secure innocence, at least in external conduct, even for a limited time, and in an incomplete degree. It is not pretended that watching is a safeguard against all possible evil, even external evil; but still, that it certainly hinders a great deal of it; that it is a very material check, for instance, upon bad conversation, as well as upon many other dangers incidental to the free association of boys with one another; and that, considering how much of youthful sin is



traceable to these causes, such a check cannot but act well in the formation of virtuous habits. Hence it becomes even a safeguard, in one way, against the admitted dangers of reaction when liberty succeeds to control; for habits are formed by the constant repression of temptation. Again, many a youth dies *in statu pupillari*, and thus never encounters the battle with the outer world at all. To those who are so happy, it will have proved an unspeakable gain to have been preserved any how, even from a single sin; and by this method of restraint boys are preserved from many, even though not from all, sins. The frightful and well-authenticated stories of immorality in Protestant schools (to which many converts bear personal testimony) come strongly in aid of the established theory of discipline.

I fear I have not been able to state the case of the two sides with sufficient impartiality to conceal to which of the two I incline. It certainly appears to me, that the directors of seminaries would incur a most serious responsibility by innovating essentially or extensively upon the established method. Having said thus much, however, I will make the following reserves and admissions:

1. I must explain what I mean by *surveillance*, and what I don't mean by it. I don't mean, then, the *surveillance* of a sentinel, a turnkey, or a duenna. I mean the watchful, patient observance of a loving and sympathising eye. There are few duties of a rector of a college which require, I should imagine, greater circumspection and discrimination than the choice of those officers who are to represent him in the constant superintendence of the boys. This duty demands a very rare union of zeal and judgment, vigilance, and kindness, tact and simplicity. Pope's picture of a discreet wife may serve as the description of a good Master of the Bounds, or Dormitory:

"Who, while he rules them, never shows he rules."\*

He must so temper restraint by prudence as to inspire the impression of liberty, while he maintains the reality of control. His influence should be like that of the practised host, who puts every one around him at his ease, without lowering his dignity or compromising his position. Moreover, he must have a clear insight into what he may allow and what he must repress. He must know where liberty ends and license begins, where gaiety ceases to be harmless and foibles deepen into sins. He cannot be too indulgent, so long as he does not connive at what is positively wrong. It would be hard indeed to light upon such a person by chance; but I suppose he is not hard to find in colleges where a thoroughly right spirit has grown up.

\* As an example of the opposite kind of *surveillance*, I may mention the practice of some French schools, as related to me by an eye-witness. The presiding master, during the play-hours, is perched up at a high desk, whence his vigilant eye scans, with inevitable penetration, the busy scene around him. A poor youth, forgetting himself for the moment, indulges in some forbidden gambol, but is instantly recalled to a sense of duty by the shrill voice from the pulpit, "*Monsieur, quatre pages d'histoire!*"

2. It would seem best that, as the course of a student proceeds, direct *surveillance* should be gradually relaxed, and more and more room given to the sense of personal responsibility. I certainly do think it an evil that the passage from the state of *surveillance* to that of entire personal freedom should be too abrupt, and a young man thrown as it were head and shoulders into the responsibilities of a town mission without any previous training in the habits of self-reliance.

3. Where the stricter system of discipline prevails, it ought, surely, to be maintained *without interruption*. If, for instance, young men are allowed to go where they like, and do as they like, in vacation time, certainly I think it would be better if they were left more to themselves at college. If you mean to trust to their power of self-government at particular seasons, it would seem better to train them to the practice of it at other times. The most desirable arrangement, and one which I wish could be generally adopted, would seem to be that of country-houses in connection with the colleges, at which students might enjoy the advantage of change of air, scene, and occupation, without being removed from the discipline to which they are subjected at college.

4. But the only real security, after all, against the evil of an excessive reliance upon external and merely temporary aids, is to be found in constant moral and religious training. The critical time in a young man's life when he is to be no longer "under tutors and governors," but thrown upon conscience and the simple thought of the Unseen but All-seeing Eye, should, I suppose, be repeatedly, or rather incessantly anticipated in sermons, in private exhortations, and—though last, not least—in the still more persuasive form of easy and informal conversation. I could fancy that a wise superior would even make it his especial business to explain to the students the real purpose of this probationary discipline, to point out its ends and obviate its deficiencies.

I pass at length, with real satisfaction, to that portion of your correspondent's letter in which I am able to feel that we are entirely and cordially at one. I know too little of the interior of Catholic colleges and schools to pronounce upon the extent to which what he happily calls the "police system" prevails over the confidential. All I can say from experience is, that when I was myself at St. Edmund's twelve or thirteen years ago, it could not be said with truth that discipline was carried out to an extreme, or in a stern and unamiable spirit. My kind friend Dr. Cox, who was at that time president, was the very embodiment of human kindness; and I say it in his praise, and not to his discredit, that in all my life I never met with a man who would have made a worse policeman.

Thus I am relieved from the painful necessity of treating the interesting question your correspondent has opened otherwise than hypothetically; and as I am dealing with liabilities only, and not with admitted facts, I can speak with all the greater freedom. Let me say, then, that I agree in every word which "X. Y. Z." has

written in favour of eliciting and cultivating the affections, as an integral part of all moral tuition ; of dealing with boys and young men as individuals, almost indefinitely different in character and capability, and of making that personal individuality which belongs to each one of us the basis of the moral superstructure which is to be raised upon it. I believe "X. Y. Z." to be entirely right, and to put forth a great truth, when he says that the triumph of Divine grace is the sanctification of the individual character, and not the creation of any common character into which the original and significant distinctions of nature are absorbed and lost. The characteristic varieties of the saints, and, as your correspondent justly observes, of none more than the Apostles themselves, place this view of the case beyond a doubt.

If all this be so, it follows that a more fatal error cannot be committed in education than to deal with its subjects upon a hard regimental principle. It follows also that to ignore instead of managing, to crush instead of educating, training, and directing the natural affections, is even to outrage God's work, and, as it were, affront His image. Not so, as might be abundantly shown, did our Lord, nor St. John the beloved disciple, nor St. Paul. I have heard of its having been even said that "a strong and decided development of natural affection is a disqualification for the priesthood." The sentiment is so odious, as well as so paradoxical, that I doubt its having ever been broached, and I quote it merely as a way of giving shape to the opinion which your correspondent has so well combated. On the contrary, I know of no gift which should be more highly prized in a priest than that of a warm and susceptible heart, and this all the rather because some of the tendencies of his state, if left to themselves, might operate in a contrary direction. The constant familiarity with scenes of sorrow has a natural, though not a necessary, tendency to harden the heart. The severance of family ties is another trial to the priest, especially if not living in community. Yet, despite all natural disadvantages, the priest is habitually called upon, not to *affect*, or merely *profess*, sympathy with every form of human sorrow, but to *feel*, in some real way, the miseries of others ; and my own belief is, that the circumstances of his state, so far from being *necessarily* (as Protestants allege) adverse to sympathy, may become, with proper care, even favourable to it. We are all acquainted with priests so happily constituted or disposed, as to be able to throw themselves into each special case of (real) distress which comes before them with a power of personal appropriation which seems rather to grow than to decline by habitual exercise. I am sure that there are also those on whom the sacrifice of domestic endearments has no other effect than to open their hearts all the more affectionately upon those spiritual children whom God has given them in the place of natural relations. Yet further, I think I also know some who love their natural relations none the worse, and perhaps all the better, for acting habitually upon the obligations of their state. For it is the peculiar attribute of Christian charity,

as distinguished from human love, that concentration tends, as in the case of sun-light, not to the absorption, but to the diffusion of its beams. Hence the truth which your correspondent has so well pointed out, that it is through the exercise (of course regulated) of special affection that the habit of charity is fostered ; and, *vice versa*, that those who make a point of stifling special affection, on the plea of cultivating general benevolence, usually end in looking upon all mankind with equal indifference.

Heartily, therefore, do I unite with him in hoping that the time may never come when it could be truly said to our students, "Si decem millia pædagogorum habeatis, sed non multos patres." Those who are to act towards others in a fatherly spirit, must themselves have been in youth the objects of a fatherly care. Indeed, if any modification of this spirit in the government of youth has to be sought, it must be looked for in the characteristic tenderness of the other parent rather than in the mechanical discipline of the pedagogue. It is said that the ministerial gentleness of St. Edmund of Canterbury is to be traced principally to the fact of his having fallen in his youth under the care of a wise and affectionate mother.

With a larger infusion of the parental spirit will necessarily disappear all those artificial modes of government which used to prevail with such fatal results in the Protestant schools and monasteries, but which are gradually giving way to the good sense of the age. I refer, of course, to what is expressively called "humbug" in all its various branches. With this affectionate spirit will vanish also those miserable errors and subterfuges in the management of boys and young men, the only effect of which is to raise up a prolific crop of young hypocrites. Such are, *inter alia*, slyness, the affectation of knowledge, and the use of misplaced raillery. No man is a hero to his children any more than to his *valet de chambre*, and we had better all of us give up the attempt to appear so. Acting a part is a course which is sure to break down in the long-run, and great is the fall therefrom. The only successful basis of all government (the government of youth especially) is CONFIDENCE ; and confidence, while it will survive the shock of occasional disedification, is sure to be stifled in the grasp of habitual constraint.

Your obedient servant,

F.

---

## Literary Notices.

*The Gregorian Hymns for Vespers* (according to the Mechlin edition of the Roman Vespers), reduced to Time, and harmonised in Four Parts. By the Rev. W. J. Dolan. (London : Burns.) The reason which has induced the editor of this arrangement of the hymns, whom we must congratulate on the general excellence and scientific value of his harmonies, to reduce them to common musical measure, is because, when there are no bars, there are various ways in which the notes may be grouped and the phrases accentuated ; so that unless there is a perfect understanding between the singers, they cannot keep together. Mr. Dolan meets the difficulty by reducing all the hymns to "Time." The hymn-tunes being set to verse, that is, to a known rhythmical sequence of accentuated and unaccentuated syllables, must themselves have such a rhythm, and this rhythm may be expressed by the common divisions into bars. Not that Mr. Dolan wishes it to be understood that his barring is the only one right or possible ; he only wishes by them to point out *one* mode in which an intelligent musician might naturally sing the plain-chant hymns from the plain-chant notes.

In general, we think it a great mistake to attempt any metrical adaptation of the plain-chant ; it shows that the adapter scarcely recognises the difference between the rhythm of oratory and the rhythm of music. Declamation cannot be measured by the beats of a metronome, or by the sequences of accents in a bar ; it depends on the sense or the articulate sound of the words or syllables. The plain-chant seems intended to preserve this declamatory rhythm ; and therefore any metrical arrangement goes far to destroy its distinctive character. And when thus arranged, the hymns must either be sung strictly by the bars, or not strictly. If strictly, their character is lost ; if not strictly, the difficulty which was intended to be avoided again emerges ; for it will require even greater understanding among the singers to feel a *tempo rubato* in barred music than to feel the declamatory accent of the unbarred plain-song. And Mr. Dolan seems to land his singers precisely in this difficulty when he tells them to sing his hymns "freely, without *too* rigid an adherence to the time." Again, the barring of melodies is intended to govern both the groupings and the accentuation of notes. But, in matter of fact, Mr. Dolan's barring sometimes governs neither, as in the hymn at p. 41, where the notes are so disposed as to show bars within bars, and where the accentuation proves that the signature  $\frac{5}{2}$  is a mere delusion ; as he has grouped the notes, the real rhythm is  $\frac{3}{2}$  for one bar,  $\frac{2}{2}$  or C for one bar,  $\frac{3}{2}$  again for one bar, the line concluding with a minim, or  $\frac{1}{2}$  bar. The second line would be the same. As the barring now stands, the bars not only cut

across groups of notes which ought to be sung together, but the accentuation varies with every line, and is generally wrong.

Mr. Dolan was struggling almost with an impossibility, unless he had recourse to the artifice of changing his signature almost with each bar ; but then he would have only introduced new difficulties instead of the old. We are sure that, in spite of all attempts, it will remain best to sing and play the plain-chant from plain-chant books ; and organists who are not competent to put harmonies extempore will scarcely play Mr. Dolan's excellent but difficult harmonies properly. Good organists will not be tied down to them, and bad organists will not be able to play them. We must once more bear our testimony to the learning, patience, and skill which Mr. Dolan's arrangements exhibit ; only we think that we perceive in them the amateur's foible of sometimes seeking for novelty, and avoiding common chords where common chords would come in with better effect. On the other hand, we have noticed one place where common, not to say namby-pamby, harmonies disguised a passage which afforded a tempting opportunity for a bold musician.

*Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America.* By the Abbé Em. Domenech. 2 vols. (London : Longmans.) It is a pity that the translator of this excellent book should make us wish we had the French rather than the English before us. Under such manipulation the most lively stories become somewhat dull reading. After discounting this defect on the translator's part, and after noting the fact that the Abbé is sadly to seek on some scientific subjects on which he feels bound to communicate his observations, because there is no one more competent who has been over the same ground ; and also that he is given to speculate in a singularly old-fashioned manner on certain questions of origins of races and languages, where, indeed, the uncertainty of our knowledge opens a wide gate for all manner of dreams ;—after noting these drawbacks, we have nothing but unqualified praise for the writings of a man who, while devoting his life to a labour of love among the poor people he describes, could have his eyes open to their peculiarities, could store his memory with all that he saw, and could tell what he remembered with such liveliness. Not that the book is a lively one on the whole : the Abbé Domenech probably knows more about these North-American Indians than any one in Europe, and in these volumes he seeks to tell all he knows of them and of their country ; so we have disquisitions on all kinds of things upon which it would be impossible to write in a lively manner. But the book is a good one in spite of the translator, and should be in the hands of every one interested in ethnology.

---

# Current Events.

## HOME AFFAIRS.

### *National Defences.*

THE Royal Commissioners appointed last autumn to consider the defences of the United Kingdom, have reported their conviction, both on military and financial grounds, that neither our fleet, our regular army, nor our volunteer forces, nor even the three combined, can be relied on as sufficient in themselves for the security of the kingdom against foreign invasion. At the same time, they fully recognise the immense importance of the Channel as a first line of defence, and of a Channel fleet to maintain it; and starting from this recognition, they proceed to urge the primary necessity of protecting the dockyards and arsenals which serve as the base of our naval operations, and without which a single disaster might annihilate our naval power. This protection they think cannot be given effectually by the fleet itself, which has other and more appropriate duties to perform; nor can it, any more than the general defence of the country, be safely intrusted to the small bodies of troops which, in case of an invasion, we should now be able to devote to it.

If we met the difficulty by increasing our army, we should have to do so at an immediate cost of 111*l.* a man for enlistment expenses and the necessary increase of barrack accommodation, besides an annual outlay of 60*l.* or 70*l.* a man for pay, provision, clothing, barrack repairs, pensions, &c. So that, if we merely doubled the number of regular troops actually at home, viz. 66,000, exclusive of the Indian depôts, we should have at once to provide 8,000,000*l.*, besides adding 4,000,000*l.* a year to our ordinary liabilities.

As an alternative to this expenditure, the commissioners propose a system of fortifications, which they are of opinion will be more effectual as well as cheaper. These fortifications would involve an outlay, once for all, of 10,390,000*l.*, besides a small

annual charge for maintenance, and would include the protection of those vital points at which an enemy would strike, and of harbours whose possession would give him sure bases of operation in positions favourable to his design. The royal dockyards, Woolwich arsenal, Portland, Dover, and Cork, are the stations which the commissioners refer to these two heads: the defence of London and of our commercial ports they do not consider within the scope of their instructions.

For the permanent defence of the stations indicated against attacks by sea, the commissioners recommend the adoption of advanced works, consisting either of open batteries secured against a *coup-de-main* by a tower or defensible barrack in their rear, or of casemated batteries, according to local circumstances; and they suggest, for the same purpose, the use of an improved floating battery, which is described as a powerful iron-sided steam-vessel, capable alike of maintaining a fixed station or manœuvring in a general engagement, of sufficient size to afford a steady platform for working the guns, yet not so large as to be unmanageable in narrow waters, mounting from twelve to twenty guns, having a speed of from eight to ten knots, and of as light a draught of water as is consistent with other good qualities.

The land defences are considered with the twofold view of providing against bombardment and capture. To gain the first end, the commissioners conceive that, in cases where the nature of the country would admit of the enemy's obtaining a full view of the object of attack, within practicable range (*i. e.* about 8000 yards), it is necessary to establish defences so as to command the ground within that limit; but that wherever the object of attack is screened from view by hills, there is no necessity for occupying any position beyond the features of ground which afford

such cover. To gain the second, they recommend that the works should be so designed as to be capable of being defended by a small body of men against a *coup-de-main*; but that they should, at the same time, have capabilities of resistance that will enable them to withstand any attack likely to be brought against them. With this view, they should be provided with redoubts at their gorge, by means of which an enemy would be prevented from holding the work, if he should succeed in obtaining partial possession of it. The main ramparts should be capable of affording a heavy fire of artillery and musketry in those directions over which an

enemy must make his approach; and bomb-proof cover should be provided for the garrison. In situations where the ditches can be filled with water, no revetment need be constructed; but wherever this is not the case, they should either have escarps and counterscarps, or detached walls of masonry, and in either case they should be flanked both by artillery and musketry.

The following statement shows in tabular form the number of guns, amount of barrack accommodation, and estimated expense of all the works recommended by the commission, together with similar information respecting those in progress :

| STATIONS.                                    | Guns. |           | Barrack accommodation, chiefly Bomb-proof. |           | Expense of Works, including purchase of Land. |            |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|--------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|------------|
|                                              | No.   | Total No. | No. of Men.                                | Total No. | —                                             | Total.     |
| <i>Portsmouth and Isle of Wight:</i>         |       |           |                                            |           | £                                             | £          |
| Recommended by Royal Commission . . . .      | 987   | ..        | 7,320                                      | ..        | 2,400,000                                     |            |
| In works in progress . .                     | 280   | ..        | 1,500                                      | ..        | 400,000                                       |            |
| <i>Plymouth:</i>                             |       | 1,267     |                                            | 8,820     |                                               | 2,800,000  |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 742   | ..        | 7,010                                      | ..        | 2,670,000                                     |            |
| In works in progress . .                     | 120   | ..        | 1,000                                      | ..        | 350,000                                       |            |
| <i>Fembroke:</i>                             |       | 862       |                                            | 8,010     |                                               | 3,020,000  |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 163   | ..        | 1,700                                      | ..        | 600,000                                       |            |
| In works in progress . .                     | 150   | ..        | 1,000                                      | ..        | 165,000                                       |            |
| <i>Portland:</i>                             |       | 313       |                                            | 2,700     |                                               | 765,000    |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | ..    | ..        | ..                                         | ..        | *250,000                                      |            |
| In works in progress . .                     | 300   | ..        | 2,300                                      | ..        | 350,000                                       |            |
| <i>Thames:</i>                               |       | 300       |                                            | 2,300     |                                               | 630,000    |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 110   | 110       | 1,100                                      | 1,100     | 180,000                                       | 180,000    |
| <i>Medway and Sheerness:</i>                 |       |           |                                            |           |                                               |            |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 204   | 204       | 1,400                                      | 1,400     | 450,000                                       | 450,000    |
| <i>Chatham:</i>                              |       |           |                                            |           |                                               |            |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 335   | 335       | 3,550                                      | 3,550     | 1,350,000                                     | 1,350,000  |
| <i>Woolwich:</i>                             |       |           |                                            |           |                                               |            |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 150   | 150       | 1,500                                      | 1,500     | 700,000                                       | 700,000    |
| <i>Dover:</i>                                |       |           |                                            |           |                                               |            |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 30    | ..        | 300                                        | ..        | 170,000                                       |            |
| In works in progress . .                     | 60    | ..        | 300                                        | ..        | 165,000                                       |            |
| <i>Cork:</i>                                 |       | 90        |                                            | 600       |                                               | 335,000    |
| Recommended by R. C. .                       | 90    | 90        | 600                                        | 600       | 120,000                                       | 120,000    |
| Total guns and barracks .                    | 3,721 |           | 30,580                                     |           |                                               |            |
| Armament of works recommended by R. C. . . . | ..    | ..        | ..                                         | ..        | ..                                            | 500,000    |
| Floating defences . . . .                    | ..    | ..        | ..                                         | ..        | ..                                            | 1,000,000  |
| Total estimate of expense .                  | ..    | ..        | ..                                         | ..        | ..                                            | 11,850,000 |

\* 100,000*l.* for purchase of land, and 150,000*l.* for works already projected.



It is proposed that these works should be manned, to a large extent, by the infantry of the line and militia, the local artillery militia, the pensioners, and the artillery volunteer corps. And their number and extent, therefore, has not been determined by any reference to the actual or probable strength of the Royal Artillery. To carry out the entire scheme, it would be necessary to purchase about 10,500 acres of land, about 1500 of which would be occupied by the works, and the rest would become a source of revenue to the extent of about 25,000*l.* a year. 2500 pieces of artillery would be required besides those which are actually mounted, or which had been already demanded for works sanctioned before the commissioners drew up their report. All such works have now received their express approval, and are of course incorporated in their general scheme of defence.

The Government having determined that our store of materials of war should no longer be concentrated in one place, the question of the choice of a site for the new dépôt was referred to the commissioners, and is discussed in a correspondence appended to their report. Weedon, which had been recommended for the purpose by a previous commission, is now stated to be unfavourably situated for defence; and from the "many more eligible places" which they think might be found, the commissioners select Cannock Chase, in the middle of Staffordshire. They add a suggestion for the formation, under certain circumstances, of another arsenal on the western sea-board at a spot in the neighbourhood of Birkenhead.

On the 23d July, Lord Palmerston brought the whole subject before the House of Commons in committee by moving the following resolution: "That it is the opinion of this Committee, that towards providing for the construction of works for the defence of the royal dockyards and arsenals, and of the ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a central arsenal, a sum not exceeding 2,000,000*l.* be charged on the consolidated fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury be authorised

and empowered to raise the said sum by annuities for a time not exceeding thirty years, such annuities also to be charged upon the consolidated fund."

Insisting with unusual plainness and force on the necessity of our being prepared for a war with France, Lord Palmerston maintained the substantial adoption of the commissioners' proposals to be absolutely essential for the safety of the country. As the contemplated works, if required at all, were obviously required at once, he proposed to take measures for completing them in the course of three or four years, the shortest period within which it would be possible to do so; and he thought that by raising the money as it was wanted, on terminable annuities running for thirty years, the requisite despatch would be secured; while the country would not have to bear a much heavier burden than would be incurred by spreading the works over eighteen or twenty years, and waiting to undertake each till the slow process of annual votes brought in the money that might be necessary. With regard to the amount, he explained that the outlay for floating defences would be included in the annual estimates, and that guns would be forthcoming in the ordinary course as fast as the works became ready to receive them; so that 1,500,000*l.* might be deducted from the special estimate of 10,390,000*l.*, leaving about 9,000,000*l.* only to be provided for. Of this, the Government was of opinion that 2,000,000*l.* was as much as could be advantageously expended within the next twelve months, so that it was not necessary to ask for more than that amount during the present session; and it would afterwards rest with the Government of the day to apply to Parliament for such successive portions of the 9,000,000*l.* as might be found necessary in the course of each successive year. The design was to put the money thus raised into a separate account, by means of an Appropriation Act, and to have an annual statement laid before Parliament for each instalment. Till 1867 the annuities on which the money was to be raised would be an additional charge on the country; but in that year an an-

nual payment of 580,000*l.* would fall in by the extinction of the terminable annuities of 1823, and this 580,000*l.* would from that time more than cover the interest to be paid on the 9,000,000*l.*

From a subsequent statement of Mr. Sidney Herbert's, it appeared that the works which the Government proposed to commence this year would involve for their completion an expenditure of about 5,000,000*l.*, though only the 2,000,000*l.* would be actually laid out within the twelve months. Of this 2,000,000*l.*, 540,000*l.* is for Portsmouth, 300,000*l.* for Plymouth, 130,000*l.* for Pembroke, 180,000*l.* for the Thames, Medway, and Chatham, and 20,000*l.* for Cork. But it is to be divided in larger or smaller sums among all the stations pointed out by the commissioners, and a schedule is to be laid before Parliament showing the distribution in detail.

In the adjourned debate, Mr. Lindsay moved an amendment to the effect that, "As the main defence of Great Britain against aggression depends on an efficient navy, it is not now expedient to enter into a large expenditure on permanent land fortification." Mr. Bright pointed out that, although the creation of a central arsenal was included in the Government resolution, the cost of it was not included in the estimate of 9,000,000*l.*; and after complaining that the proposed works would ultimately involve the expense of a large addition to the regular army, he went on to review, in a strain of elaborate and bitter irony, the various schemes of national defence which have recently been published by private individuals, as well as the proposals and proceedings of the Royal Commission. But beyond this there was no serious opposition to the Government resolution, which was carried by 268 for to 39 against.

#### *Privilege of the House of Commons.*

On the 29th of June, Mr. Walpole brought up the report of the Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons to search for precedents bearing on the rejection of the Paper Duties Abolition Bill by the House of Lords; and on 5th July Lord

Palmerston, on behalf of the Government, moved the following resolutions, which were ultimately adopted: "1. That the right of granting aids and supplies to the Crown is in the Commons alone, as an essential part of their constitution, and the limitation of all such grants as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, is only in them. 2. That, although the Lords have exercised the power of rejecting bills of several descriptions relating to taxation, by negating the whole, yet the exercise of that power by them has not been frequent, and is justly regarded by this House with peculiar jealousy, as affecting the right of the Commons to grant the supplies, and to provide the ways and means for the service of the year. 3. That to guard for the future against an undue exercise of that power by the Lords, and to secure to the Commons their rightful control over taxation and supply, this House has in its own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes and frame bills of supply, that the right of the Commons, as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, shall be maintained inviolate."

As the Committee confined their report to a mere enumeration of precedents, without offering any opinion or making any comments upon them, the force and bearing of the various facts adduced by them must be estimated by the help of broader and less cautious authorities. The House of Commons, by virtue of its privilege, lays claim to the exclusive power of imposing and remitting taxes; and this claim is always so far recognised that the Sovereign addresses the Commons alone on the question of supply, and thanks them alone for supplies at the end of the session. But the taxing and legislative functions are of course distinct from one another; and the House of Lords as distinctly claims an unlimited participation in the latter as the House of Commons asserts an exclusive right in the former. Each stands on its own ground, and regards the double question as one whole from its own point of view—the House of Commons bent on reserving to itself the integrity of the taxing power; the House of Lords careful to prevent the Commons from

dealing with matters of general legislation under cover of money-bills. Each, indeed, extends its assertion of privilege beyond the limit of its substantial rights; but it only does so in order to defend those rights more effectually, and is patient of contradiction outside their sphere so long as they themselves remain intact. And thus,—the House of Commons formally claiming every thing, and the House of Lords formally conceding nothing,—there has grown up between them a constitutional practice which endorses the extreme theory of neither, while it secures the real aim of both. According to this practice, it rests with the Commons alone to initiate money-bills, whether for the imposition or repeal of taxes; and the Lords do not amend any such bill except by the correction of mere clerical errors, by trifling alterations in furtherance of its intent and object, or by striking out or modifying some clause which, though appended to the bill, is foreign to its real matter. Similarly, when a money-bill has involved any question of general policy, such as protection, religious freedom, and the like, the Lords have held themselves entitled to reject it on grounds appropriate to that question, and the Commons have acquiesced in the rejection. But the cases in which this has occurred are far less frequent than those in which amendments have been allowed; and no instance has been found in which the Lords have rejected a simple money-bill on purely financial grounds, under the impression that it was their duty to square the income and expenditure of the year. Such an instance would be the only complete precedent for the course pursued with regard to the Paper Duties Abolition Bill; and the act of throwing out the bill must therefore be admitted to have been, whether justifiable or not, an innovation on the existing constitutional usage.

Nor can the change be considered an unimportant one. It is argued on behalf of the Lords that their interposition, if irregular, was at all events beneficial, inasmuch as it preserved a certain item of the revenue of the year which the Commons had imprudently agreed to sacrifice. This

may be so; but if the imprudence of one House, judged by the other, is to be the measure of that other's allowable intervention, then there is an end of settled right on both sides, and no reason exists any longer why the Lords should not originate money-bills as well as amend and reject them. Besides which, it is necessary to show, in order to the validity of the argument, not only that the sacrifice of the paper duty was unwise, but also that there was no remedy which could serve as an alternative to the prevention exercised by the Lords, no equivalent derivable from some other source for the Commons to devote to the public service. Now, in one way, such an equivalent had already been granted, because the annual budget proceeds on a balance of imposition and repeal of taxes, so that the revenue of each year is voted in part on the faith of the concurrent remission, and the two combined in one scheme form the complement of each other. And, apart from this consideration, if at any time the calculations on which the budget is framed turn out to be erroneous, or if circumstances afterwards arise to disturb the equilibrium of income and expenditure, it is always as much in the power of the Commons to restore the balance as it was originally to adjust it, by granting whatever additional revenue may be necessary, without any extraordinary intervention on the part of the other House. Moreover, the act of the Lords in this case tends not merely to vindicate for them a share in the taxing power, but virtually, within the limits of that act, to transfer it to them altogether. For the yearly estimates, being originally prepared by command of the Crown, and laid by its ministers before the House of Commons, go up from that House with the joint sanction of two branches of the legislature; and the final act being thus in the Lords, their reversal of the decision of the Commons is equivalent to their assuming the sole responsibility of the position in which they leave the question. So that if, as in the present case, they decide against the remission of a tax which the Crown and the House of Commons propose to them to remit, the tax

comes to be levied by their act and deed, and virtually the supply is granted by them alone, in spite of the House of Commons.

How far the resolutions carried by Government really satisfy the emergency, may perhaps admit of question. They contain, no doubt, a distinct declaration of the rights of the House of Commons with regard to money-bills; and it may be conceded to Mr. Gladstone that, "as far as words go," they are sufficient. But it matters little that "this House has in its own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes, and frame bills of supply, that the right of the Commons, as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, shall be maintained inviolate," if the power remains unexercised and the bills are not so framed. It is one thing for the Lower House to enter on a formal conflict with the Lords about an act which is done and over, another thing to take the necessary precautions against the recurrence of such an act in future.

### *The Religious Census.*

In compliance with the wish of the Dissenters, the Government have modified their Census Bill by withdrawing the provision for a return of religious profession. On 11th July, Mr. Baines moved the omission of the clause, and stated at some length the case of the Dissenters. They were not, he said, ashamed of avowing their religious persuasion, nor did they fear the results of the proposed enumeration; but they deemed it a duty to resist an authoritative demand on the part of the Government upon a point which they regarded as beyond the legitimate scope of civil interference. A more inapplicable argument it would perhaps be difficult to frame; and Mr. Baines himself effectually disposed of it by referring to the fact, that Government were actually prepared to withdraw the penalty attached to a refusal of the return so far as the religious part of it was concerned. The penalty being removed, the demand would cease to be, in any strict or objectionable sense, an authoritative one; and it is something more than difficult to understand the scruple which pre-

vents a man from designating himself in a census paper by the title which he spontaneously adopts on every other occasion. Sir George Lewis dwelt on the obvious inconsistency of people who, under the very name of Protestant Dissenters, petitioned the House against being forced for once to call themselves so, and withdrew the clause with a recommendation to the objectors to reconsider their position during the next ten years, "not upon grounds of instinct and sentiment, but upon argumentative and rational grounds;" in which case he trusted that the progress of inquiry and intelligence would lead to the removal of prejudices which at the present moment were invincible.

Those who cannot share so cheerful a conviction, will at least desire to find their own anticipations deceived. Under the strong and growing pressure of popular intolerance, one's first sympathies are naturally with any minority asserting what they conceive to be a principle; but if the Dissenters have done more in this case than merely set up what they hoped other people would take for a principle, they have been far less fortunate in their advocate than we are at present willing to consider them. Mr. Baines is no doubt quite correct in saying that a large number of persons who habitually attend the worship of the Establishment in the morning, and that of the Dissenters in the evening, would find a theoretical difficulty in determining under what particular class of Protestants to rank themselves. But when he goes on to argue against the tyrannous indelicacy of compelling men "to ask their guests and the inmates of their houses what is the religion they" *profess*, one can only marvel at the organisation by which "twenty legions" of thinking beings can be marshalled under such a banner, and maintained in their fidelity to such a cause. Happily the dissenting leaders are indifferent to the feelings of heads of families on the other side of St. George's Channel; and Mr. Monsell was able to elicit an assurance that the religious census would not be abandoned in Ireland. But for the rest of the kingdom, for the next ten years at

least, we must content ourselves with the absence of information such as Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Prussia, Saxony, Sweden, and Wirtemberg possess as a matter of course; and while we thus lag behind all the more civilised states of Europe, our Protestant Dissenters will have the comfort of knowing that we do so out of deference to their "instinctive feelings."

### *Indian Legislation.*

The Government have introduced and carried an important measure of Indian legislation, for the amalgamation of the European forces with the regular army.

The European forces of the late East India Company, transferred to the Crown in 1858, amounted to about 24,000 men; but, in consequence of the recent discontents arising out of the transfer, nearly half of that number have taken their discharge, and the force at present amounts to little more than 12,000 men. It is agreed on all hands, however, that a European army of 40,000 men must be maintained in India; and the question therefore arises whether the remainder of them should be raised exclusively for Indian service, under the old Act, or simply added together with the existing 12,000 to the regular army, so as to abolish all distinction between what have hitherto been the two forces.

A royal commission, appointed in 1858 to consider generally the organisation of the Indian army, split into two parties. A majority, consisting of five officers of the regular army, were in favour of the amalgamation; a minority, consisting of four officers of the Indian army, were against it; and as the same peculiarity characterised the evidence,—that of old Queen's officers tending in one direction, and that of old Company's officers in the other,—neither side had a clear advantage in point of authority. Lord Derby's Indian and war ministers, following the same rule of contrariety, were opposed to each other on the question; and his government arranged a compromise by which a local army was to be maintained to the extent of two-fifths of the whole number of European troops required.

This settlement was at first accepted by the present Government; and Sir Charles Wood, in now proposing to supersede it, represents himself as having yielded an unwilling assent to the force of argument and reason. The outline of his plan is, that the European regiments in India should form part of the Queen's regular army, the existing officers retaining their position, rising by seniority, as they do now; that officers should be eligible for general service, rising by seniority to the rank of captain, and afterwards, by selection, to the rank of major and lieutenant-colonel; that the existing officers of the Indian army should be employed, either as they now are in the regular regiments, or in various situations on the staff; and that ultimately vacancies in the staff-corps should be filled up by candidates selected from the Queen's general army. But all that he has at present called on Parliament to do is to sanction the *principle* of amalgamation, by repealing the Act which gives authority for the raising of an exclusively Indian force; and the general features, as well as the details, of the new scheme still remain for discussion.

Great stress was laid by Sir Charles Wood, in his introductory speech, on the argument that the army in India should belong to the governing power; and he quoted a strong opinion of the Duke of Wellington's in support of his view. The proposition, as it stands, seems scarcely to need such support; but it would have been more to the purpose to show its relevancy to a question which concerns, not the already-accomplished transfer of the East India Company's troops to the Crown, but merely their claim to an organisation differing in some respects from that of other portions of the royal army. Our militia and volunteers belong to the governing power as absolutely as the regular troops, though the first can only be sent out of the kingdom under certain contingencies, and the second not at all. And it is no more an "anomaly" that India, paying for her own army, should have an exclusive right in the army for which she pays, than that our volunteers, providing themselves with the sinews of war, should reserve their strength

for the defence of their own homes. Even if it were, the entire position of India, with regard to this country, is anomalous beyond all precedent in history; and happily the passion for symmetry is not one which has ever deeply, or for long together, affected English legislation.

A better argument in favour of the amalgamation is that derived from the danger of mutinous combination. A movable force, which is constantly changing its situation, and periodically renovates itself by a return home, is obviously far less likely to endanger the public safety than one permanently located in India, and having a separate interest from the rest of the Queen's troops. Nor can the discipline of any force—the interior economy of its regiments, and the relations existing between officers and men—be subjected to a greater disadvantage than that which arises from constant service in a deteriorating climate, and habitual exemption from the supervision of the higher military authorities.

But the question does not concern the European troops in India alone. The maintenance of a native army, whether desirable or not, is an inevitable necessity, and such an army cannot be maintained in entire dissociation from the European force without its officers and men losing their self-respect and *esprit de corps*. And then, as regards our regular army, the amalgamation would of course largely increase the period of foreign service; and it is worthy of consideration how far this would not tend to deter men of social position from entering as commissioned officers, a result which is earnestly to be deprecated on political as well as military grounds. Moreover, in a country like India, it is scarcely possible to separate the officers of the army from the work of civil administration; and that work can only be carried on successfully by men who have been trained to the Indian service, who have gone to India before their ideas were formed or their habits fixed, and who have made its administration the business of their lives. Such men there can never be any certainty of finding in the regular army, nor is there much probability of it; and if the men are not in ex-

istence, it is of no present use holding out inducements to attract them. But of course it does not follow that because regimental officers have hitherto been chosen for diplomatic and other civil appointments, they must for ever continue to be so; and Sir Charles grounds his proposed staff-corps, to a large extent, on the argument that, whether the local army were maintained or not, it would be indispensably necessary to put an end to this system, and to provide officers for the civil service from a source which would not impair the efficiency of the regiments.

### *Irish Education.*

Thursday, 16th August, the question of the education of the Catholic Irish, and the demands of the Irish Bishops, were discussed in the House of Commons. A year ago the Bishops had asked for the total abolition of the national system, and the introduction of denominational schools. Their demand was founded on the violation of the original agreement on which the national system was accepted, by the changes introduced to satisfy the Protestants. Probably it was also considered that if the original measure was a great improvement thirty years ago, the importance of Catholics in Parliament had since then increased, and a greater concession might be fairly expected. The Government had, however, replied that the national system should be unconditionally maintained, and the Catholics of Ireland waited patiently to see what would be proposed. The Catholic members of Parliament addressed a letter to Mr. Cardwell, a few days before the debate, requesting to be informed beforehand of his intentions, but no announcement was made until the evening of the 16th. Mr. Cardwell then stated, that it is the intention of Government to admit non-vested schools; to revise the books, in order that they may be in harmony with the feelings of Irishmen and Catholics; and, above all, to increase the number of Catholics on the board to an equality with the Protestants. On the last measure every thing depends, for it will be in the power of a well-constituted board to undo most of the mischief

which has been effected by the authority of the commissioners.

The defenders of the existing system, in particular the Attorney-General of Ireland, argue that it is a question of sovereignty between the State and the Catholic Church. The weakness of its adversaries has been that they failed to accept that issue, and to argue it as a question of liberty. For it is the same principle that has been discussed with so much energy in all the parliaments of countries where the Church is tolerated—at Paris, at Frankfort, and at Berlin, and every where the conclusion has been in favour of freedom against sovereignty. It is to the successful vindication of it that Belgium owes her independence.

The Church is necessarily at all times an educational institution. The school is as necessary to her as the pulpit, and the Protestant Churches can no more do without it than the Catholic. Even the Peace of Westphalia calls it *annexum exercitii religionis*, and long after the Peace of Westphalia the school remained under ecclesiastical supervision in Protestant and in Catholic countries alike. For centuries it was never discovered that education was a function of the State, and the State never attempted to educate. But when modern absolutism arose, it laid claim to every thing on behalf of the sovereign power. Commerce, industry, literature, religion, were all declared to be matters of State, and were appropriated and controlled accordingly. In the same way as all these things education belongs to the civil power, and on the same grounds with the rest it claims exemption. When the revolutionary theory of

Government began to prevail, and Church and State found that they were educating for opposite ends and in a contradictory spirit, it became necessary for the State to remove the children entirely from the influence of religion. This spirit of hostility was not, however, universal, and it was quite possible, especially in these countries, to admit the claims of the modern State without serious danger. For there are two alternatives almost equally plausible, suited to different states of society. Either the school belongs to the Church, and preserves a confessional character, where people of different religions reside together, or else the particular religious tone is completely neutralised. This can only be done with the assistance of the State, and of a State which is not involved in religious quarrels. In Prussia this is possible, for religious equality is acknowledged in government. But in Ireland the State has failed to do that which was required of it to make the national system work well. It does not stand above sectarian differences; it has not stripped off a confessional character. Instead of controlling parties, it is still the instrument of a party. It cannot escape from the fatal union with the Established Church in Ireland. Whilst that institution subsists and blights the country, the Catholics cannot place entire confidence in the State. The independence of Church and State is not enough for freedom, so long as the Government acknowledges a specifically religious character. This is the case in several German states, where a Catholic monarch is the head of a Protestant Church.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

### *France and Europe.*

THE failure of the French plans at Baden not only opened the eyes of the nations to their danger, but in general led them to take precautions to meet it. An exception is the defensive alliance of Holland and Belgium, which was possible while it was doubtful whether Prussia might not

seek compensation in Luxembourg for losses on the Rhine, but which Holland now objects to as both one-sided and dangerous. But Belgium has uttered her national protest, and turned, July 21, the twenty-ninth anniversary of Leopold's accession into a demonstration in favour of its nationality. After Baden, the grateful princes of Germany invited the

Regent to complete the good work by renewal of friendly relations between Austria and Prussia; and the interview of Töplitz, July 24, was the result. That meeting produced an understanding between the two Powers, not only on German but on European questions, as the *Prussian Gazette* announced on the Sunday following, and added, "There is no doubt but that Austria will continue in the path upon which she has entered, and that she is resolved upon following her new policy, not only as regards religious questions, but also in reference to the different nationalities of the empire. Thus Austria will obtain a position which will increase her strength at home and abroad." On the other side, the Emperor, on his return to Vienna, desired that the reforms promised a year ago "should be finished and promulgated at as early a period as possible." The great reform is the power given to the Reichsrath, which will be a guarantee for a comparatively liberal policy that may lay a solid foundation for harmony between the North and the South. "Up to the present time, moreover, the whole influence of Austria has been directed to the support of the petty princes, whose subserviency was in turn secured by the unpopularity of their own administration. The people, especially in the northern states, necessarily looked for a counterpoise in Prussia, so that the natural rivalry of the two great monarchies was sustained and embittered by a permanent and growing divergence of internal policy." Austria, moreover, seems to have relinquished her idea of asking Germany to guarantee her non-German provinces. But in case of Austria and Italy going to war for the possession of Venetia, Austria would not be called upon to furnish her contingent to the federal army; and though Prussia would not interfere while Austria and Italy are the only belligerents, she would help Austria as soon as any other power joined in the fray.

The unexpected union of Germany, combined with the immense difficulty which the Emperor of the French found in coming to terms with the English Government about intervention in Syria, and possibly

some obscure hope of playing into the hands of Mr. Bright, in his opposition to our fortification scheme, induced Napoleon III. to write the following letter to the English nation, sent under cover to the French ambassador in London:

"St. Cloud, 25th July 1860.

"My dear Persigny,—Affairs appear to me to be so complicated—thanks to the mistrust excited every where since the war in Italy—that I write to you in the hope that a conversation, in perfect frankness, with Lord Palmerston will remedy the existing evil. Lord Palmerston knows me, and when I affirm a thing he will believe me. Well, you can tell him from me, in the most explicit manner, that since the peace of Villafranca I have had but one thought, one object—to inaugurate a new era of peace, and to live on the best terms with all my neighbours, and especially with England. I had renounced Savoy and Nice; the extraordinary additions to Piedmont alone caused me to resume the desire to see reunited to France provinces essentially French. But it will be objected, 'You wish for peace, and you increase immoderately the military forces of France.' I deny the fact in every sense. My army and my fleet have in them nothing of a threatening character. My steam navy is even far from being adequate to our requirements, and the number of steamers does not nearly equal that of sailing ships deemed necessary in the time of King Louis Philippe. I have 400,000 men under arms; but deduct from this amount 60,000 in Algeria, 6000 at Rome, 8000 in China, 20,000 gendarmes, the sick and the new conscripts, and you will see—what is the truth—that my regiments are of smaller effective strength than during the preceding reign. The only addition to the Army List has been made by the creation of the Imperial Guard. Moreover, while wishing for peace, I desire also to organise the forces of the country on the best possible footing; for, if foreigners have only seen the bright side of the last war, I myself, close at hand, have witnessed the defects, and I wish to remedy them. Having said thus much, I have, since



Villafranca, neither done, nor even thought, any thing which could alarm any one. When Lavalette started for Constantinople, the instructions which I gave him were confined to this: 'Use every effort to maintain the *status quo*; the interest of France is that Turkey should live as long as possible.'

"Now, then, occur the massacres in Syria, and it is asserted that I am very glad to find a new occasion of making a little war, or of playing a new part. Really, people give me credit for very little common sense. If I instantly proposed an expedition, it was because my feelings were those of the people which has put me at its head, and the intelligence from Syria transported me with indignation. My first thought, nevertheless, was to come to an understanding with England. What other interest than that of humanity could induce me to send troops into that country? Could it be that the possession of it would increase my strength? Can I conceal from myself that Algeria, notwithstanding its future advantages, is a source of weakness to France, which for thirty years has devoted to it the purest of its blood and its gold? I said it in 1852 at Bordeaux, and my opinion is still the same—I have great conquests to make, but only in France. Her interior organisation, her moral development, the increase of her resources, have still immense progress to make. There a field exists vast enough for my ambition and sufficient to satisfy it.

"It was difficult for me to come to an understanding with England on the subject of Central Italy, because I was bound by the peace of Villafranca. As to Southern Italy, I am free from engagements, and I ask no better than a concert with England on this point, as on others; but, in Heaven's name, let the eminent men who are placed at the head of the English government lay aside petty jealousies and unjust mistrusts.

"Let us understand one another in good faith, like honest men as we are, and not like thieves who desire to cheat each other.

"To sum up, this is my innermost thought. I desire that Italy should obtain peace, no matter how, but without foreign intervention, and that my troops should be able to quit Rome

without compromising the security of the Pope. I could very much wish not to be obliged to undertake the Syrian expedition, and, in any case, not to undertake it alone; firstly, because it will be a great expense, and secondly, because I fear that this intervention may involve the Eastern question; but, on the other hand, I do not see how to resist public opinion in my country, which will never understand that we can leave unpunished, not only the massacre of Christians, but the burning of our consulates, the insult to our flag, and the pillage of the monasteries which were under our protection.

"I have told you all I think, without disguising or omitting any thing. Make what use you may think advisable of my letter.

"Believe in my sincere friendship.  
"NAPOLEON."

No one is deceived by the assurances of this letter with respect to the French armaments, and the return to the English alliance which it announces; and the adoption of English policy for Italy and the East were probably never intended to last longer than what is hoped to be only the temporary union of Germany.

It would be premature to speak of the efforts which the Regent is said to be making to bring about the reconciliation of Russia and Austria; but the effects which the union of Germany, upon the bases laid at the conversation at Töplitz, has already produced in Italy are visible, and will be found related in the next chapter.

### *The Revolution in Italy.*

About one month after Garibaldi had virtually wrested Sicily from the Neapolitan Bourbons, the Revolution gained Naples itself; June 24, the king found himself obliged to restore the constitution which his father had created and destroyed, to grant a general amnesty, to make a total change in his ministry, to offer an alliance offensive and defensive with Piedmont, and as the symbol of all this—for nothing can be done in Italy except under some outward and visible banner—to adopt the Italian tricolor with the Neapolitan royal arms in the centre, and to promise analogous concessions to Sicily. The prestige of the government had been

previously much weakened by a peremptory refusal of France and England to guarantee the integrity of its continental states, and by its being compelled to restore two Sardinian vessels which had been captured while conveying reinforcements to Garibaldi. Two well-known liberals, Spinelli and Marlino, were intrusted with drawing up the new programme of affairs.

June 25. The new state of things was proclaimed; the next day riots broke out in Naples. June 27, Baron Brenier, the French ambassador, was struck in his carriage; some say that the cause was not political, but only domestic. However this might have been, yet since it was then generally supposed that France was the adviser of the Neapolitan movements, and that Spinelli was adopted as Napoleon's instrument to carry out the Villafraña idea of an Italian federation, which had miscarried through the opposition of Cavour, the event acquired a political importance. The next day, June 28, the whole city was in a commotion, the twelve police-offices of Naples were simultaneously attacked, and their archives burnt, whereby the amnesty was extended to the police as well as their victims, except to some forty unlucky agents who were caught and murdered by the mob. Hereupon the city was declared in a state of siege, and the castle of St. Elmo was garrisoned by the foreign troops. The state of siege was removed July 4, when the constitution of 1848 was proclaimed, or rather its legal existence admitted, and the Chambers were convoked for Sept. 10.

But the Italian Liberals and Unitarians feared the consolidation of the present Neapolitan measures as much as they feared the effects of reforms in the Papal States, and therefore they set themselves with the utmost cynicism to oppose measures which they knew and confessed to be good, because these measures, by insuring the existence of the present distribution of power in Italy, would impede the attainment of their ultimate object, Italian unity, which they evidently seek less for the sake of good government and liberty than of power. Accordingly, the offers of the Neapolitan alliance were received with popular derision in Piedmont,

and with violent denunciations against all Bourbons in the Chambers at Turin; if the ministers showed themselves more mild, it was only to gain time, or to affect obsequiousness to the advice of France and the demands of Russia and Spain. On the news of the amnesty reaching Piedmont, the Neapolitan exiles at once set out for their country; their landing at Naples, July 7, led within a week to an outbreak which committed the young king yet further to the course he had adopted. July 15, there was a popular demonstration to celebrate the return of the exiles; the royal guard fired upon the people, with shouts of "Down with the Constitution!" The ministers resigned in a body; but the king disowned the act of his guards, and his ministry therefore retained their places; but two regiments of the royal guard were removed from the city, and the national guard was substituted. Illuminations and proclamations followed, as they always do on these occasions. The ministry followed up the advantage they had thus gained, and, July 23, General Nunziante, and the chief members of the Camarilla, which the young king inherited from his father, were dismissed. All this time the Piedmontese party had been gradually gaining ground in the kingdom, till it was evidently possible that Garibaldi, the herald of the Sardinian *statuto* of Italian unity, could march into Naples whenever he chose. He agreed, however, with his chief partisans to put off his attack till after the convocation of the Chambers, when, if the majority was annexationist, as expected, it would be possible to legalise beforehand by a vote a measure that would otherwise be nothing but a *coup-de-main*.

The career of Garibaldi in Sicily, uniform in military success, has been politically checkered. Appearing in the island as the champion of Italian unity, and the agent, understood though disowned, of the cabinet of Turin, he surprised every one by suddenly arresting and banishing from Sicily M. Lafarina, the agent of Cavour, July 7. It must be remembered that Lafarina was one of the Sicilian leaders in 1848, and is the author of the popular revolutionary history of the Italians. Lafarina summed up his differences with Gari-

baldi as follows: "Lafarina believed in the necessity of the immediate union of Sicily to Piedmont; Garibaldi that it should be put off till the whole of Italy, including Venice and Rome, was liberated. Lafarina objected to several of Garibaldi's ministers, some because of their inconstancy, and some as Mazzinians or Bourbonists; whereas Garibaldi sought to unite all elements for the national cause. Lafarina thought it strange that Garibaldi should abuse Cavour, neglect those Sicilians who had supported the Revolution in 1849, should overthrow the whole administrative organisation, close all the tribunals, refuse to form any police force, make unknown or ill-known men governors of provinces, set his face against the national guard; should alarm Sicily by making Palermo the hotbed of all the most incorrigible Mazzinians of Italy; should threaten to put to death a journalist who wrote against Mazzini, but allow the *Precursore* to say that Piedmont would only give up Sicily to the Bourbons again to purchase their alliance." After this quarrel, Cavour sent M. Depretis to be his agent with Garibaldi instead of Lafarina. Several of Garibaldi's ministry resigned, and their places were filled up with known Mazzinians.

After the fall of Palermo (May 27) had secured the west of Sicily to Garibaldi, he spent six weeks in organising his forces for attacking the strong places still held by the Neapolitans in the east, namely, Messina with its advanced post, the peninsula of Melazzo in the Straits, and Agosta and Syracuse in similar relations further south. At Messina there were about 14,000 men under General Clary, and a garrison of some 1500 at Melazzo. But the Neapolitans only held the two towns and the road between them. The Italian tricolor floated outside their lines, and the secret national committee of Messina sat at Barcelona, a few miles west of Melazzo, where they gathered the nucleus of a national force, which the Neapolitans neglected to sweep away while they could. Garibaldi despatched Colonel Medici (July 12) to organise these materials; and at the same time Naples showed symptoms of being

about to lose the command of the sea, through the desertion of the *Veloce* and the general refusal of the crews of other vessels to act against Italians.

In this state of things, Clary wished to abandon Melazzo, and concentrate his forces in and around Messina, again taking possession of the heights which he had abandoned, but from which the town and citadel might be bombarded. However, the views of Colonel Bosco, a Sicilian, prevailed, and a column of 4000 men was sent out under him to meet the enemy near Melazzo. Some skirmishing took place on the 17th and 18th without any decided results, and the Neapolitans took up their flank position for the protection of Messina under the shelter of the guns of Melazzo, exhibiting therein the feeblest possible amount of strategy.

On the 18th, General Cosentz arrived with his seasoned troops from North Italy; and the next day Garibaldi appeared with about 1200 men on board the *City of Aberdeen*, and prepared to attack the garrison of Melazzo the next day. On the 20th was fought the battle which decided the fate of Messina. The castle and town of Melazzo are situated on a narrow peninsula, connected with the mainland by a neck of low land, towards which some great roads converge on a parallelogram about four miles long and two and a half deep. The land between these roads is thickly planted with vines, olives, and canes, which gave excellent cover to the Neapolitan sharpshooters. Through this Garibaldi, with an attacking force of about 5000 men, gradually made his way, and took the town after fourteen hours' fighting. On the 25th, Colonel Bosco surrendered the citadel, with 50 guns, 139 horses, and 100,000 rounds of ammunition. The attacking force was materially assisted by the fire of the ex-Neapolitan frigate *Veloce*.

On the 27th, Colonel Medici found the heights above Messina abandoned, and so he marched into the town, which was also evacuated; and the next day a convention was signed with General Clary for an armistice, the Neapolitans to retain the citadels of Messina, Agosta, and Syracuse. From this moment Garibaldi's preparations were all directed to an

invasion of the continental states of Naples.

About this time the King of Sardinia, under pressure of fears occasioned by the attitude of Austria, since her understanding with Prussia at Töplitz, wrote to Garibaldi, ordering him not to cross the straits, nor to foment troubles in Umbria and the Marches, or to give any assistance to any such undertaking, which would not only be useless to the common cause, but would also drag the King into the greatest difficulties with the Powers most favourable to Italy. He declared that he did not wish to be King of Sicily, and that he should not be sorry to see the island under the rule of a member of the reigning family of Naples.

At the same time Farini went to Genoa to prevent the embarkation of several expeditions that were upon the point of sailing for Naples and the Papal States. But the Italian Liberals have got beyond the power of Count Cavour. Garibaldi answered the King plainly that he did not hold his commission from him. Nevertheless, the wishes of the sovereign seem to have made some impression upon him; for the *Times* Correspondent, who has the best information, writes this August 1:

"In the interview of to-day Garibaldi laid down for the first time the conditions under which he would consent to stop in his career of victory. A prolongation of the armistice for five days was agreed upon, and General Clary leaves this evening for Naples to carry there the conditions. He is to be back on the evening of the 5th inst.

"As for the conditions, their aim is to unite the north and south of Italy for all practical purposes, without actually driving away the Bourbons. The question is neither more nor less than of a kingly brotherhood, the assimilation of their two kingdoms, one policy and one army. Of course, in this union Victor Emmanuel, as the eldest of the two in the path of Italian independence and freedom, is to have the command of the whole army, and the lead in the Italian policy to be pursued; Naples to follow, and to be assimilated to Italy, retaining, however, its reigning family. As a first step in this as-

similation, an exchange of troops—Italian troops to Naples, and the Neapolitans to the North, to undergo a healthy transformation, and thus become national troops. The navy *idem*. The constitution adapted to that in force in Upper Italy. The custom-house line between the two portions of Italy abolished."

Aug. 4. The Sardinian *statuto* was proclaimed for Sicily.

During this whole time Naples had been in a state which allowed every man to do as he pleased. Garibaldian journals were printed; Garibaldian committees organised; the army and the navy were enticed from their allegiance; the Count of Syracuse and other members of the royal family fraternised with the Unitarians, and declared for Piedmont; and it appeared certain that the conquest of Naples would be even easier for Garibaldi than the conquest of Sicily had proved to be; when the same events that had frightened Victor Emmanuel encouraged Francis II. to stand up manfully for the few remaining prerogatives of his position. About the middle of August, it was confidently asserted that an Austrian note existed, threatening the Court of Turin that any further complicity in the measures of Garibaldi would be reckoned a *casus belli*, and that the Romagna would be occupied with Austrian troops. It was further rumoured that, as Garibaldi had publicly announced his intention of attacking Venice, with the Neapolitan fleet, after he had taken Naples, Austria was determined to defend herself at Naples, and to attack Garibaldi as soon as he crossed over from Messina.

These threats, coupled with the consciousness that the Sardinian army had been fearfully weakened in the last war, and since that by the loss of the Savoyards, and by the numerous desertions that had taken place of men who went to serve under Garibaldi, induced the government of Turin to issue orders to its provincial governors to prevent any preparations for the invasion of neighbouring states. Farini went to Genoa and succeeded in stopping an expedition which was destined for the Papal States. M. Bertani was sent to Sicily to speak with

Garibaldi; and Garibaldi seems to have left Sicily on the 12th in a Sardinian frigate.

Francis II., on the other hand, saw that the time was come to attempt to arrest his fall. He ordered that the constitutional laws for the repression of the licenses of the press should be put in force; he suppressed three journals hostile to his government; he dissolved the electoral committees, whose object it was to secure the election of Unitarian representatives to the Chambers; reinforced the garrison of the city; notified to the governments his intentions to fire upon any vessel, under any flag, that might attempt to land men on his shores; and finally declared Naples in a state of siege.

And so the situation remains, Aug. 18.

### *The Papal States.*

The Papal States have had to play no part in the events of the last two months; they have been quiet, with the exception of some insignificant agrarian disturbances at Monteporzio. All accounts agree, however, in describing the population as ready to rise whenever Garibaldi has gained Naples, and in affirming that the Italian portion of Lamoricière's army, with the exception of the gendarmes, is entirely untrustworthy. Most of the stories to the disadvantage of the Irish contingent are ridiculous exaggerations, and the best authorities agree in describing the little Franco-Hibernian battalion as the *élite* of the whole body. But though Lamoricière's army is thought too weak to guard the States, the French garrison is abundantly sufficient to guarantee the personal security of the Pope, and his possession of Rome; and beyond this neither the pamphlet *Le Pape et le Congrès*, nor Napoleon's letter to M. de Persigny, pretends to promise him.

The despatches of Mr. Lyons, describing the condition of the States between 1854 and 1857, which are the most valuable contributions to the Roman question, make one thing abundantly clear,—that however willing the Papal government were to make reforms, all were impossible because the Liberals would not accept them. The discontent was not against definite grievances, but against the Pa-

pal system; and grievances were popular because they made the system unpopular, and because they proved that a clerical government is unsuited to an age of civilisation and progress. So it was in Tuscany: the Grand Duke was driven away because he was an Austrian; the Pope is to be dethroned because he is a priest, with very little respect to the quality of their governments.

The only remedy that Mr. Lyons had to propose for this was, the secularisation of the government. But Cardinal Antonelli could never be brought to see that this would differ from the abolition of the Papal rule altogether. As the Pope is an ecclesiastic, he said, his government must be ecclesiastical.

But this secularisation of the government was not to be the precursor of free institutions. Instead of the restoration of the old municipal liberties, the Liberals only had the introduction of the Code Napoleon and of the conscription (a measure which Cardinal Antonelli ardently desired) into the States. Of course the religious foundations would go, as they have gone in Piedmont, and the division of property would in a few generations extinguish the nobility.

"The views of the clergy and of the mass of the laity, in matters of government, seem to have become irreconcilably opposed; an antipathy of caste has grown up between them, wholly irrespective of belief or disbelief in the Roman Catholic religion." The prelates who have posts in the government may, indeed, sometimes be laymen; "but whether he takes orders or not, a man who enters the *prelatura* is understood to pledge himself to the civil supremacy of the clergy. He is expected not only to dress as a churchman, but to think and act as one."

"I agree with M. de Rayneval in believing that the disaffected do not desire the reform, but the overthrow of the government. The more ardent and intelligent Romans, like other Italians, feel humiliated by the poor part their country plays in the world. They believe that under the temporal rule of the Popes things can never be otherwise. The mode in which the clerical system was restored has made it odious to them.

..... Their standard of value for a scheme of reform, is the means it would supply for throwing off the yoke of the Holy See. They willingly enter upon the long list of their grievances against the administration; they love to dwell upon them, and to exaggerate them; but they listen with manifest impatience to any proposal for remedying them under the present rule. I had almost said, that they do not desire to see them remedied; that they would be sorry to have fewer causes of complaint—sorry for any thing that would diminish the extent or the intenseness of the disaffection."

In these words Mr. Lyons sets up a monument to the infamy of the Italian Liberals which history will note. On the whole, his despatches confirm all the *facts* of M. de Rayneval's celebrated memoir, though of course he finds enough differences of opinion, and enough objections to details, to eke out a despatch. This is no more than a rival diplomatist is necessitated to do.

July 13. The Pope made an allocution, deploring the blows aimed at his authority and against religion "by the unjust usurpers of legitimate power in Italy." The Subalpine government having usurped Parma and Piacenza on the 19th of April, drove out the Benedictines from Parma, and (May 10) closed the Seminary at Piacenza because the Bishop refused to sing the *Te Deum*; the Bishop was afterwards arrested, carried out of his diocese to Turin, fined and imprisoned, as were also the Vicar-General and some of the Canons.

In the Æmilian and other provinces "subject to the unjust dominion of the Cisalpine government," Bishops, ecclesiastics, and religious have been subjected to a harsh inquisition, and not a few arrested, exiled, or imprisoned. The Provicar of Bologna was carried away from the Cardinal-Archbishop's deathbed, fined, and imprisoned. On the death of the Archbishop, the revenues of the see were taken by the government; the Bishop of Faenza was fined and imprisoned; the Cardinals Archbishop of Pisa, Bishop of Imola, and Archbishop of Ferrara were all imprisoned or persecuted.

In Sicily two religious orders were

suppressed (Jesuits and Redemptorists), and some ecclesiastics scandalously took part in the government that did this wrong. And in the provinces annexed to Sardinia many of the sees are vacant. Hence it is abundantly clear, that the wish to destroy the temporal power of the Pope is only a means to an end, and that end is the destruction of the Church.

### Syria.

The massacres in Syria, instead of being, as usual, the mere vendettas of hostile tribes, have this year been raised into an event of European significance by the state of the Turkish empire; for their magnitude and atrocity are far too great to be referable to local causes alone; but they are immediately connected with the general condition of the empire,—the state of popular feeling, the weakness of government, the vicious administration, the public bankruptcy, and a strong impression that Europe will never unite to put an end to the general mismanagement.

The last great war between the Druses and Maronites was concluded in 1845. The first symptoms of the new outbreak occurred in the summer of 1859, when a skirmish occurred between the Druses and Maronites at Beit Mizi, near Beyrout, one Sunday afternoon; several persons were killed, but a perfect reconciliation was proclaimed.

Early in May 1860, the Druses murdered a monk in a convent between Beyrout and Deir-el-Kammar. The Christians retaliated by killing the first Druse they found. Then the Druses killed two Christians, whose relations in return killed two Druses, according to the native law of blood-feuds.

At this time the government might easily have stopped all further mischief if the slightest trouble had been taken; but nothing was done. War broke out May 28, on which day thirty-two villages were seen burning from Beyrout. Consul-General Moore said, May 29, that as far as he had then learned, the contest began by a body of Christians in the Meten attacking three mixed Druse and Christian villages, and driving therefrom the Druse inhabitants. This information has been eagerly seized

upon in the House of Commons, where, in spite of the horrors they have committed, the Druses are the favourites, not to justify, but to palliate their conduct. Lord Palmerston also believes the Druse stories of the committee of Maronite Bishops in Beyrout being at the bottom of all the disturbances. It is only a prejudiced eye that could read thus the papers that have been laid before Parliament. On the 29th, the Druses marched to within forty minutes of Beyrout, and in the face of Kurschid Pasha and all his camp (for he had gone out on pretence of stopping the war), murdered, burnt, and plundered in the village of Hadad, the Turkish soldiers firing upon the Christians. The refugees from the burnt villages were cut to pieces by Druses and irregular troops near Beyrout, May 30 or 31.

May 29. Hasbeya, a large town under Mount Hermon, was attacked; Othman Bey, the Turkish commander, invited the Christians into the Serai for greater security, and got them to deliver up their arms, which he allowed to fall into the hands of the Druses. For a week they remained there with hardly any food or water, till on the 5th of June the Druses were let in upon them, who slaughtered every male over five years old; the Turks slaughtering those who escaped the Druses, except some fifty who hid themselves under dead bodies. "Women," says Mr. Graham, "the Druses did not slaughter, nor for the most part ill-use; that was left for Turks and Moslems to do, and they did it." The sister of the Druse chief had advised the Christians not to enter the Serai, but they unhappily mistrusted her. 400 who put confidence in her were saved, and have been conveyed to Beyrout.

Next the Christians at Sidon suffered, entirely at the hands of the Moslems and Turks, especially the Bashi-Bazouks.

June 3. Deir-el-Kammar, the ancient capital of the Lebanon, with a population of about 7000, was attacked, but the Druses were repulsed; but the next day the Christians solicited peace, which was granted; but the Druses made their own terms. Life was safe within the walls, but all movable property was plundered,

and those who ventured outside the town were cut down. Next, June 19, Zaleh, with a population of 10,000, was taken; the bulk of the people had gone out to surprise the attacking army, but arrived at the pass only in time to see their town in flames. Ottoman troops took part in this business also.

After this, the tragedy of Hasbeya was reenacted at Deir-el-Kammar. The Turkish governor persuaded the Christians to give up their arms, and invited them into the Serai, where about 1200 males were butchered, and the women horribly abused by the Turkish soldiery. After this the town was burnt. Mr. Graham has visited the place since, and has described it in a despatch to Lord Dufferin.

The same thing was about to take place at Sidon, where the Turkish authorities had also disarmed the Christians, June 26; but the catastrophe was prevented by the presence of two English and two French men-of-war.

After the events of Deir-el-Kammar, the European consuls at Beyrout, who up to this time had communicated only with Kurschid Pasha, opened communications with the Druse chiefs, who "clearly showed they had not been the chief agents in the inountain war, but had sold themselves to the Pashas." After this was made clear, Kurschid Pasha forced the Druses and Christians to accept a pacification, the only article of which was that "bygones should be bygones." Up to the time of this pacification, sixty towns and villages of the Lebanon had been destroyed, and 75,000 persons, many of them accustomed to the luxuries of civilisation, rendered destitute. The murders are estimated at 4000; namely, 1200 at Deir-el-Kammar, at Hasbeya and Rasheya 700, at Sidon 505; above 200 refugees cut down near Beyrout, May 30; and about 1000 in the villages; but all these males.

Almost on the day on which peace was proclaimed in the Lebanon, massacres began at Damascus, where there were about 130,000 fanatical Moslems to about 15,000 Christians. The attack began July 9, in the afternoon; the house of the Russian consul was the first to be attacked; then some of the houses of the leading Christian

merchants were burnt. The mob then began to burn the whole Christian quarter systematically. The Europeans found shelter either with Abd-el-Kader or with Mr. Brant, the English consul. The Arabs and Khurds were allowed to enter the gates, and they assisted the fanatical mob of the capital in murdering the men and insulting and carrying off the women.

The Christian quarter, says Mr. Brant, was set fire to on Monday the 9th, and was still burning on Sunday the 15th; every church and convent was plundered and afterwards burnt; those that were rich in plate were not plundered by the rabble, but by the soldiers. Abd-el-Kader's few Algerines found it possible to save numbers, while Achmet Pasha declared it was impossible for him to do so. The Pasha also, though repeatedly urged, neglected to have the gates guarded. When Othman Bey, the butcher of Hasbeya, returned to Damascus, Achmet received him with an ovation; and if the Moslem Emir Shohab with his family was killed at Hasbeya, it is noticed that he was a personal enemy of the Pasha of Damascus, and was slaughtered, it may be supposed, not without the consent of Achmet. Captain Paynter reports the loss at 1,200,000*l.* sterling; "2000 dead bodies (or, according to Mr. Brant, from 3000 to 5000) were to be seen among the ruins, and 20,000 houseless wanderers (this must be an exaggeration, as the whole Christian population was put down at 15,000), whose only crime was that they were followers of Christ, now live on charity, and ask for justice from the hands of Europe."

On Wednesday, July 17, Fuad Pasha, the minister for foreign affairs at Constantinople, arrived at Beyrout with troops, as commissioner extraordinary from the Porte. He sent off the Pasha of Beyrout and Othman Bey, and, Aug. 4, declared that he had already arrested more than 400 persons guilty of having taken part in the massacre, and by the next day hoped to have the notables who had been compromised in his power. He had named an extraordinary commission, and those found guilty were to be immediately executed. A great part of the plunder, furniture and valuables, had been recovered. All these

were fine words; but Aug. 14, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe read a letter from Smyrna in the House of Lords to the effect that Kurschid Pasha had arrived, not under arrest or in any disgrace, but in full possession of his honours, and with his flag flying. Hence, he said, he feared that unless care was taken, these measures will stop with the mere repression of the local disturbances; perhaps on the same footing as Kurschid's "pacification" of the Lebanon, on the basis of "oblivion of the past."

It has since been reported that the offending Pashas, who had been sent to Constantinople to be tried, have been degraded, and sent back to Beyrout and Damascus to be tried by mixed commissions.

Ever since the first news of these massacres reached the west of Europe, June 28, the courts of the great powers have been in the greatest excitement. In France the old dream of an independent Egypt under Mehemet Ali reappeared in favour of an independent Syria under Abd-el-Kader. On the other hand, Prussia and Austria agreed at Töplitz that the Turkish empire was to be maintained as long as possible, and in England Lord John Russell steadily adhered to the policy of Lord Stratford; so steadily, indeed, that at one time it seemed likely to lead us into a war with France, and the Porte professed that he only consented to the intervention of the powers in Syria in order to prevent a collision between France and England. The Sultan himself wrote to the French Emperor, July 19, announcing the nomination of Fuad Pasha as extraordinary commissioner, and plainly claiming the right to settle the Syrian affairs in his own way. "Let your majesty be convinced that I shall employ all my powers for establishing security and order in Syria, and that I shall severely punish the guilty parties, whoever they may be, and render justice to all."

The Emperor of the French was obliged to yield to the opposition of all the other Powers against taking the matter out of the hands of the Porte; and, Aug. 3, the representatives of the Five Powers and of Turkey signed protocols at Paris, announcing the Sultan's acceptance of the proffered aid of the other Pow-



ers; their troops not to exceed 12,000 men, half to be furnished immediately by France; the commander of the expedition to act in concert with Fuad Pasha; the Powers to maintain a "sufficient" fleet on the coast; the occupation to determine in six months, and the Sultan to afford every facility for vic-tualing the expedition. The second protocol was a declaration that "the contracting Powers do not intend to seek for, and will not seek for, in the execution of their engagements, any territorial advantages, any exclusive influence, or any concession with regard to the commerce of their subjects such as could not be granted to the subjects of all other nations." This was backed up by a recommendation to the Porte to fulfil "the solemn promises" of 1856, "that serious administrative measures should be taken to ameliorate the condition of the Christian population of every sect in the Ottoman empire." In these conditions Lord Stratford regrets two things: that the Turks were not obliged themselves to put down the disturbances in the first instance; and that no sufficient time was given them to do so. If it had been, and they had failed, then the European troops might have come in with greater effect and propriety. He evidently does not expect that the intervention will end in six months, and he demands that the most stringent measures which international law sanctions shall be adopted to interpose a barrier between the races, the contention between whom occasioned these events. He hopes that they will no longer be allowed to occupy the same mixed villages, where quarrels are engendered, and the Turkish officers have opportunities either of interference or non-interference, both equally disastrous.

The Emperor of the French seems to entertain the same opinion as Lord Stratford of the futility of the limitations of the protocols. When he sent his contingent from the camp at Chalons, he told them that though they did not leave in great numbers, their courage and their prestige would supply the deficiency, because wherever the French flag is seen to pass, nations know that a great cause precedes it, and *a great people follows it*. Which last words may mean any

thing up to a grand national emigration of France into Syria.

August 20. In reply to Mr. Mon-sell, Lord Palmerston pointed most distinctly at France as the instigator of the disturbances in Syria. Some months ago large quantities of arms were conveyed to Syria and placed in the hands of the Christians, and a newspaper has for some time been published under the auspices of the French Government, in the Arabic language, which has contained the most inflammatory articles. This is part of the policy pursued by France throughout the Turkish dominions, where it is constantly keeping up the feud between the Christians and the Turks. "Nothing," said the Count de Morny, on the 11th July, "nothing contributes more to induce a country to surrender itself (*se livrer*) to him who brings order and authority than the spectacle of revolutionary disorders, and nothing contributes more to induce France to preserve the government she has given herself." But in order to keep alive this sentiment of gratitude and devotedness, it is necessary to renew continually the impression of the merits of the government in restoring right and order. The spectacle of disorders must be frequently revived, that the government may have the opportunity of earning new claims to submission. It must incite aspirations which it may have the credit of satisfying, and create disturbances for the sake of composing them. New knots have to be perpetually tied, that there may be a call for the sublime agent who has the gift of unravelling them. But as all internal movement is dangerous to the stability of the throne, these opportunities must be sought abroad. Every little complication and weakness is therefore assiduously cultivated, every sore place is rubbed to inflammation, and the skeletons in all men's houses are made to exhibit an unusual and most annoying restlessness. There is that capital principle of nationality with which every State may be disturbed in its turn by that power which possesses the most compact national character in Europe. The great cause of Christianity and civilisation is a still better card, but it can only be played with effect in the East. If the sick man should

die or mend, it will be a sad day for the charlatan who turns his allments to so much account. Meantime the Emperor is to enjoy the reward of his intrigues in the East, and those who opposed the Syrian policy of France in 1840 look rather foolish. A great performer on that occasion, Sir Charles Napier, has done public penance for the achievements by which he then acquired the fame which he has not since increased, and when a member declared in the House of Commons that he regretted the part England had taken in the Crimean war, he was cheered by the Tories.

But the evil is neither in the convention of 1840 nor in the Crimean war. The cause of the present troubles lies in the policy which was pursued after 1840 in Syria, and in the peace which concluded the late war. The Christians and the Druses lived formerly in peace together under a chief who belonged to neither party, and who was almost independent of the Sultan. This must be remembered when we are told, by Lord Palmerston and others, that the cause of the present outbreak is the weakness of the central power. That power was almost unknown in the Lebanon during the peaceful dominion of the Emir Beshir. No other European state has respected in modern times the self-government of the provinces so much as the Turks. As in the provinces of the Roman empire, the fall of the republic was felt as a blessing, and the reign even of tyrannical emperors was more tolerable than the period of republican proconsuls, so the various national groups that have been subject to the Turks have enjoyed a species of independence which seems inconsistent with the despotic character of the central rule. This is applicable partly by the union of national and religious resistance in so many tribes, which the Turks could never entirely subdue, and which, as polygamists, they were unable to absorb.

Spain, on the other hand, systematically destroyed the elements of autonomy in most of her dependencies. Naples, for instance, would be incapable of a political regeneration like that of Greece.

Then, the machinery of government in Turkey is somewhat bar-

barous. An efficient despotism must rely on centralisation, and centralisation presupposes ample means of communication. All this is wanting; civilisation still stands at a mediæval point, and mediæval civilisation presents material as well as moral obstacles to despotism which are insurmountable. This mediæval state of society subsists in all its purity in the mountainous districts of Syria.

From the insecurity of life and property, all the towns are in the mountains, whilst the plains are abandoned to the nomad Bedouins. The towns and villages are a kind of fortress; even the monasteries have an almost warlike appearance. A feud between monks of different monasteries has sometimes ended in loss of life. The house of the Bishop of Sachleh, who has now lost his life, was more like an arsenal than an episcopal residence. A traveller describes him going out to battle, in armour and on horseback, with a red turban on his head, the cross and the crozier borne before him, and his warriors behind. It is a scene of the Crusades. But religion has made extraordinary progress of late years, through the apostolic efforts of the Jesuits and Lazarists; civilisation and wealth are increasing at the same time, and the distance between the Christians and the Druses has grown greater and greater. They belong to different ages, and religion is only a secondary element in their quarrel. These causes have only become powerful of late years, and simultaneously the action of the great Powers and the policy of the Turks have aggravated their effect. For the Turks have forgotten in the hour of their weakness and decline the generosity and forbearance of former times, when their power was at its height, and was wielded by princes of extraordinary vigour. Immunities and rights which were respected then, because they were harmless, are formidable now. The Sultans have grown more despotic as they grow more feeble. The attempts to enslave the Slavonic and Roumanic provinces in Europe were baffled by Russia and the other states. Greece was liberated by the naval powers, and Egypt preserved, thanks to two able men, much of the independence that had been en-

joyed by the Mamelooks. But Syria offered a more likely field for centralisation ; for the inhabitants had no national connection with any European power, and France, the protector of the Syrian Christians, was humbled by the imprudence of M. Thiers. So the Turks resolved to use the Druses to break the growing consequence of the Christians, and a fierce war broke out in 1844, which presented on a more contracted scene many of the horrors that have so lately occurred. It was believed, both by Druses and Christians, that England was favourable to the former in their attack upon the Maronites, and the Christian fugitives on the coast fired on the English boats that came to save them. The same notions have been expressed lately. The English agents did in 1840 incite the Syrian population to take up arms against the army of Mehemet Ali. Finding that the Maronites were accustomed to look to France for protection, they naturally chose the Druses as the instruments of their influence in the country. Protestant missionaries, especially Americans, have also endeavoured to use them for the purpose of opposing Catholicism in the country. A speech of Lord Shaftesbury's, Aug. 6, throws some light on the disorganising part played by his friends in Turkey.

"There are now in the Turkish empire large numbers of persons falling away from the Greek and Latin churches, and some even from the body of Moslems. These persons, who are called Seceders, and are also known by the name of Proselytes, are acquiring very considerable influence and power ; the Sultan has conferred on them very great privileges ; they have a recognised status, and are considered one of the denominations under the protection of his government. They have likewise a representative, with free access to the person of the governor, to complain of any grievances they may experience. This has operated so largely, particularly in Constantinople, that religious liberty is making very considerable progress. I was in conversation, not long ago, with the son of a man, a converted Moslem, who has in Constantinople a large chapel where between 300 and 400 worshipers attend every Sunday, principally Mussulmans

who have embraced the Christian religion. As contrasted with the old condition of Constantinople, this is a considerable change. An American missionary, the Rev. Mr. Dickenson writes : 'The Bible is sold openly in the streets and in their mosques side by side with their Koran.' There have been established in Syria a great many denominations of a similar description, and I believe your lordships will see that the Turkish government, though weak, is not insincere, and that the Turkish central government does desire that reforms, and particularly religious reforms, should be carried to completion. But there is a large reactionary party—the old Mussulman party—who are, in a great measure, the authors of the present disturbances. That reactionary party must be overthrown, and must not receive any extraneous assistance arising out of the peculiar difficulties of the present time, and the agency now employed to put down those outrages. A very curious fact is this, that the Druses, although in hostility to the Maronites, are not hostile to them as Christians. They are hostile to the Maronites as neighbours with whom for a long time they have had grievances and quarrels ; but it is a remarkable fact, that the Druses show no opposition to Christians. Although, when their blood is up and they are in conflict, they do not draw distinctions between different sects, yet to the Christians, as such, they have no hostility ; and in proof of that I will read a letter from one of the most eminent American missionaries, who, writing in February from the now famous Deir-el-Kammar, says :

" 'The Druses appear immovable, but very useful, in the providence of God, on account of their opening the door for Christian schools, and blunting the edge of persecution. It is very difficult to effect an entrance where they do not form a portion of the population. They are the instruments of good to others, often screening Protestants and defending their doctrines.'

"I am satisfied that we must do nothing, and allow nothing to be done, that will in any way disturb the great progress which the principle of religious liberty, and more particularly the advancement of pure

Christianity, are now making through those vast regions."

It is part of the policy of the Emperor Napoleon, not only to break down all former treaties, but to be a party to no treaty that it will not be easy or necessary to break. Last year he broke through the treaties of 1815, now he has broken through the treaties of 1856. The ninth article of the peace of Paris declares that there shall be no intervention between the Sultan and his subjects. The English government declared that the intervention could only be allowed if the Sultan consented. In Italy they would not allow it when the Sovereigns demanded it; yet in Turkey the consent of the Sultan is enough.

It is clear at least that the Hatti Houmayoun remains a dead letter, that the Turkish government could not carry it out if it would, and that the evil hour is only postponed. In a letter from the East which was read in the House of Lords by Lord Stratford, and has therefore the sanction of his high authority, there occurs the following passage:

"Another cause of mischief here is the strong impression that Europe will never unite together against the mismanagement of Turkish administration. But if the Turkish Ministers were once to see at least England and France agree together on this point, you would see them act quite differently. . . . There could not, I believe, be a better or more justifiable opportunity for making a last effort to save this country, which is sure otherwise to perish, than since the last awful occurrences in Syria have fixed public attention to such an extent. Any attempt again to patch up things in the usual diplomatic way will, you may rest assured, end in no practical result, and only postpone the evil moment. . . . The public mind has been very much excited of late by passing events, and strong apprehensions are still entertained of some eventual outbreak in the capital. Poverty and discontent prevail more or less almost among every class and community. One cannot tell what may be the result of all this without some prompt and efficient change."

On this occasion it is absurd to deny that there was want of the will as well as of the power to prevent

the disturbances. The Bishop of Jerusalem writes, July 16:

"I am convinced that the Pasha of Beyrout is at the bottom of all this, and I believe that he has acted on directions from Constantinople, not of course from the Sultan or his true friends. . . . The Effendis (at Jerusalem) have held council to decide whether they should incite the Moslems against the Christians, or not, and I believe they were almost all for preserving peace."

There is nothing in the presumption of guilt on the part of high Turkish officials to exonerate the French from the suspicion of complicity. It can have required very little exertion on either side to bring things to a crisis, and thus to hasten the approach of a still greater crisis. Instead of dying of the original disease, the Turkish empire will now die of the remedies applied to it by the peace of Paris. The expectant heirs have assumed the office of physicians only in order to hasten the catastrophe, and to be able to fix the very moment when they may divide the spoils. All the efforts of our time to secure, by a boundless expenditure of Christian blood and of treasure, the introduction of Turkey as part of the European system, have failed, and the words of Burke, spoken seventy years ago, are still true: "I have never yet heard it held forth," he said, March 29, 1791, "that the Turkish empire was ever considered as any part of the balance of power in Europe. They have nothing to do with European power; they consider themselves as wholly Asiatic. . . . They despise and contemn all Christian princes as infidels, and only wish to subdue and exterminate them and their people. What have these worse than savages to do with the powers of Europe but to spread war, destruction, and pestilence amongst them? The ministers and the policy which should give these people any weight in Europe, would deserve all the bans and curses of posterity. All that is holy in religion, all that is moral and humane, demands an abhorrence of every thing which tends to extend the power of that cruel and wasteful empire. Any Christian power is to be preferred to these destructive savages."

Times have changed, but the Turks have not changed with them.











